Poona Oriental Series No. 74

61

H. 20
SSDC
880/311

ANCIENT INDIA
AND
SOUTH INDIAN HISTORY & CULTURE

BY

Dewan Bahadur Dr. S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR

11682
880
H.20 SSDC

Vol. II—SOUTH INDIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE

Oriental Book Agency
Poona
880/311

ORIENTAL BOOK AGENCY
15, SHUKRAWAR, POONA 2 (INDIA)

Vol. I—ANCIENT INDIA

This is a revised edition of the work published in 1911 which has remained long out of print. A number of chapters are added bringing the history down to 1300 A.D. The volume consists of 25 chapters beginning with a General Historical Survey up to 700 A.D. Then follow chapters on topics like the Satvatas, the Mauryan Invasion of India and the Hun Problem. The next chapter bears on the History of the Vakatakas and their place in Indian History. This is followed by Studies in Gupta History, illuminating the obscure parts of this period. Then follow a study of the dark period in Indian History following the death of Harsha. Then follows a general summary of the History of Kalinga. These with a few miscellaneous topics like the Chank in Ancient India, Gold mining in Ancient India, etc., complete this volume.

Vol. II—SOUTH INDIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE.

This volume consists of chapters on the History of South India from 1300 A.D. onwards. The first four chapters relate to the History of Vijayanagar and throw fresh light upon its history. This is followed by a general account of Penugonda. Then follow two chapters on the History of Mysore together with an account of Raghunatha Nayaka of Tanjore and Ramaraya II of Vijayanagar. There is a chapter bearing on the Rise of the Mahratta Power in the South and an interesting chapter on Golkonda History, Abdul Hasan Qutub Shah. There are a few miscellaneous items such as the local history of Madura, the heroic Raja of Desing of Ginjee, the diamond mines of South India, etc. The second part of this consists of miscellaneous topics of Indian culture, such as the Tamil Sangam, and its Age, the Mahavamsa of Ceylon and the light it throws on South Indian History, and topics of a miscellaneous character, such ar Mailarpu, Bhattavritti, Panchavaravariyam, Agnikula, topics of value for a correct understanding of the History of India generally.

POONA ORIENTAL SERIES, NO. 74.

ANCIENT INDIA

AND

SOUTH INDIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE

PAPERS ON INDIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE

BY

Rajasevasakta

Diwan Bahadur DR. S. KRISHNASVAMI AIYANGAR, M.A., HONRY. PH.D.

Vol. II—SOUTH INDIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE

POONA
ORIENTAL BOOK AGENCY
1941

PREFACE

This part contains the papers published from time to time on South Indian History and certain general topics of Indian culture. These incorporate mostly my research work as Professor at the University of Madras. They deal with the more obscure periods of South Indian History mainly, and come under the second part of the work chalked out for me as Professor, together with a number of papers and topics of Indian Culture, which I was called upon to consider from time to time. They are published here as they might prove to be useful to University students and to the general reader interested in the subject.

I am indeed very much obliged to Mr. B. Madhava Rau of the Ananda Press for getting the work through the press in the form in which it is now in the readers' hands. The special committee in charge of this work wish to place on record all those who have rendered them assistance in one way or another, and particularly to Dr. Bimala Churn Law of Calcutta for his handsome donation, which relieved them of a considerable amount of anxiety in regard to the publication of the work. I take occasion to record my own appreciation of Dr. Law's generosity in regard to the matter. I acknowledge with great pleasure the assistance rendered by Mr. T. V. Mahalingam, M.A., in preparing the index for the volume. It is to be hoped that a full and

connected History of South India, for the writing of which these were the preliminary studies, would receive fulfilment.

Several of the papers printed in these two volumes are taken from various journals, in which they were originally printed. The thanks of the committee and of myself we tender here as it was found impracticable to write beforehand individually and await permission. Our gratitude, however, is not the less because of the omission which, we have no doubt, would be overlooked by all concerned.

'SRIPADAM',
MYLAPORE, MADRAS,
1st Aug. 1941.

S. KRISHNASVAMI AIYANGAR.

CONTENTS

PART I

Chapter		Page No.
Foundation of Vijayanagar	...	1
A little known Chapter of Vijayanagar History	...	35
The Yet-remembered Ruler of a Long-forgotten Empire	...	117
The Bakhair of Rāmarāja	...	173
Penugoṇḍa	...	189
Mysore under the Woḍēyārs	...	205
Mysore and the Decline of the Vijayanagar Empire	...	251
The Scholar King of Tanjore	...	284
The King of Vellore	...	308
Rāmarāya of Vijayanagar	...	320
Maduraitala-Varalāṛu	...	336
The Rise of the Mahratta Power in the South	...	360
Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah and his Ministers Madanna and Akkanna	...	427
Rāja Dēśing of Ginjee	...	502
Note on the term 'Dainatti'	...	534
Diamonds in South India	...	536
Gollapalli Diamond Mines	...	542
An Incident in the relation of the Governor of Poonamallee with Fort St. George	...	559

202/10/11

PART II

The Tamil Śaṅgam in a Pāṇḍyan Charter of the early Tenth Century A.D. ... 577

Celebrities in Tamil Literature ... 594

The Chronology of the Śaṅgam Works so-called, of Tamil literature ... 636

India at the Dawn of the Christian Era ... 668

The Mahāvamśa and South Indian History ... 693

Miscellaneous Communications ... 718

The Konkan and the Konkani Language and Mont D'Eli ... 724

The Age of Nammāḻvār ... 729

Tirumangai Āḻvār and his Date ... 736

Tirumangai Āḻvār and Danti Durga ... 751

The Age of Peruṅdēvan, the Author of the Tamil Bhāratam ... 763

A School of South Indian Buddhism in Kānchi ... 773

Maiyiḷāṟpu ... 800

Pāñcharātra in Classical Tamil Literature ... 805

Tantra ... 820

Bhaṭṭavrtti ... 823

Vimsati–Adhyaya–Nibhaddam Mīmāmsa-Sāstram ... 829

An Iconographic Note ... 840

Pañchavāra Vāriyam ... 849

The Agnikula ; the Fire-Race ... 861

A glimpse into the Early History of Konkan ... 868

PART I

SOUTH INDIAN HISTORY

Foundation of Vijayanagar

VIJAYANAGAR is a subject of engrossing importance and taken generally to be too well-known to require further research. The facile criticism has often been made that, since there is a standard work dealing with the History of Vijayanagar, no more attention need be paid to it at all. There is still a great deal of room for research work, and original research work at that. Original research work does not consist in history at any rate, and cannot possibly consist, in the discovery of facts only or the manufacture of new facts of history. Originality consists of course in the finding of new records of facts which must have been known to somebody, and what is more in new presentation, of even known facts to let us see more of the hidden past.

The history of the foundation of Vijayanagar is taken to be so far available that it would be a superfluity in anybody to say anything about the foundation of Vijayanagar which can be of ordinary public interest. I hope to show you to-night that what was taken to be well-known exhibits so many flaws in our knowledge that a great deal has yet to be known of the history of the foundation of Vijayanagar to make our knowledge of the event complete or even adequate.

The subject of the foundation of Vijayanagar ought to be of very great interest to the members of the Mythic Society, because recent researches in this particular branch of the

subject explain that Vijayanagar is the direct outcome of an attempt by a sovereign ruler of Mysore, to secure national liberty for South India, a struggle for the beginning of which we have to go back 1500 years before the foundation of Vijayanagar. Vijayanagar was as such the offspring of the national efforts of the strongest dynasty which was purely Mysorean—the Kannaḍa dynasty of the Hoysalas.

When Vijayanagar, a century after the battle of Talikota, went to ruin and got thoroughly broken up by the repeated attacks of the combined Mussalman States, there was only one Hindu State that survived to continue her traditions, and that happens to be the State of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore. It must be to us an object of particular interest, and therefore I thought I might speak to you this evening on that particular theme.

The ordinarily available information in respect of the foundation of Vijayanagar shows that Vijayanagar was founded in a haphazard fashion. Owing to the repeated invasions of the Muhammadans under the Khiljis and the Tughlaks, the Hindus of South India were so alarmed that one of the ruling families thought it worth their while to organize something like a common or joint resistance, and the good fortune of organizing this resistance fell to an young prince of the Kākatīya dynasty that ruled over Warangal in the Nizam's Dominions. This prince, Krishnappa, laid the first stone of the foundation of Vijayanagar. The next source of information which is purely Muhammadan in character is the usual Hindu tradition that Vidyāraṇya was performing a penance when two brothers Hakka and Bukka came on a hunting excursion; and,

being tired, chanced to come upon this Vidyāraṇya who was then absorbed in contemplation. They watched him at this auspicious place, because they thought that they found in him one who would help to stem the tide of the Muhammadan advance. When the sage returned to consciousness they sought the explanation of a peculiar phenomenon, a rabbit keeping at bay a lion or tiger. The sage predicted imperial greatness for the spot. Laying the foundation there, the disciples too resolved to stay there. That was the foundation of Vijayanagar.

A further study of the previous history and the history of the particular half century with which the foundation of Vijayanagar is specially connected, leads us to the inference of a very much more prosaic foundation for the great city. A hint of this can be had from the Muhammadan historians on the subject. It was a struggle in the south for its own distinct existence as against the all-destroying forces from the north. The struggle though slightly different in character, lasted ever since the day of the great Mauryan Emperor Asoka. The resistance practically started then, and has gone on through all the varying dynasties in the changing chapters of the history of South India. Till 1300 A.D. we find in one form or other the same struggle carefully maintained all through the changing fortunes both in the Dakhan and in the South. Vijayanagar is but one incident of that great struggle.

The whole of India south of the Narbada was divided into four parts about A.D. 1300. The country north of the river Krishna was divided into two halves. The eastern portion was the kingdom of Warangal and the western was

then the Yādava kingdom of Deogir (Dēvagiri). South of the Krishna likewise the whole country was divided into two parts. The plateau portion was ruled by a dynasty that is Mysorean, with their capital in the place which now goes by the name of *Haḷēbīd*.

The other portion was ruled over or dominated by the Pāṇḍyan kings. One feature which gives character to South Indian History is, as I pointed out many years ago, "struggle for empire." The struggle for empire was dangerous, while it lasted; but coming to an end, resulted in the creation of a new empire. So far as my knowledge of this history goes, it was clearly not a question of aggrandizement at the time. Something more fundamental was the moving factor in that struggle for empire.

The Government under the Hindu rule usually was organized into two clearly defined sections—local and imperial. Local Government remained unchanged in character from time immemorial and that was hardly affected by the changes of the dominating dynasty. The duty of the imperial government was to defend the country and guard against foreign invasion to which India had been always liable. So the imperial government was organized for purposes of war whereas the local government remained almost unchanged in its essential machinery or principles. The struggle for empire therefore meant necessarily a struggle for bringing about a common government for imperial purposes. That struggle both in Northern and Southern India failed to achieve a permanent result, and in that failure lies the tragedy of Indian history. Finally there came peace, and peace not of a permanent character

to the country. That was the way that imperialists of earlier days groped their way ultimately to found an imperial organization, without the mechanical equipment which modern imperialism has ready to hand.

This ever changing "struggle for empire" among the Hindu powers was somewhat complicated by the irruption of the Muhammadans in the South. The coming of the Muhammadans made the usual active struggle imprudent, if not impossible, and the existing political division did not provide the imperial organization necessary to cope with the new enemy. The need therefore of imperial organization was brought home to the individual States constituting South India. They struggled and suffered, and in the periods of respite from the struggle they had slowly to mature the needful organization. This responsibility fell on the southern powers, among them, upon the Hoysalas as being nearest the danger zone and somewhat conveniently placed for carrying out a plan if not altogether unobserved at least a great deal unnoticed. The one ruler who was responsible for the organization of this South Indian resistance was the last Hoysala Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III. His career as ruler and the history of South India of his time will show clearly the actual leading cause to this consummation was the progress of Muhammadan conquest in the South and the need for dislodging them from where they settled in what appeared a permanent occupation. This was the Muhammadan kingdom of Madura to the history of which we shall now pass.

The Muhammadan Kingdom of Madura.—Malik Kafur's invasion of the south reached as far as Madura

and Rāmēśvaram according to Amir Khusru's circumstantial account of this southern invasion. It is also clear that although a few places he mentions are not yet capable of satisfactory identification, enough of his account could be made out to justify the statement that the objective of Malik Kafur after he left the territory of the Hoysalas was the country of Vīra Pāṇḍya.*

There is very little doubt left that he marched in support of Vīra Pāṇḍya's rival Sundara Pāṇḍya whose territory proper was Madura and the country round it. When he returned early in A.D. 1312, Malik Kafur in all probability left a garrison behind to safeguard the position of his protégé Sundara Pāṇḍya. Almost the next year we find the Malabar king Ravi Varman Kulaśēkhara of Kēraḷa in occupation of the country from the South Pennar to as far north as Poonamallee, it may even be Nellore, indicating clearly that the so-called Muhammadan conquest meant at best no more than the occupation of Madura and a comparatively narrow district round it. Sultan Mubarak Khilji sent Khusru Khan against Ma'bar in A.D. 1318 either to regain lost hold, or it may be to make a fresh conquest of it. Whatever was the actual purpose, Khusru remained a whole year in Ma'bar and hatched his plot there to subvert the ruling dynasty at Delhi. Barani complains of his ill-treatment of the Muhammadan merchants there, and says that he developed his *hinduising* plot while there. This

*Malik pursued the "yellow-faced Bir" to Birdhul an old city of the ancestors of Bir. Elliott III, 90.

Paras Dalvi desired that "Bir Dhul" and "Bir Pāṇḍya" might be reduced. *Ibid.* p. 88. This could mean no more than the Chōḷa and Pāṇḍya country of Bir, or Vīra Pāṇḍya.

certainly cannot be held to mean that he took any direct part in encouraging the Hindus to throw off the Muhammadan yoke in the south. For South Indian History this may be held to mean no more than that he brought back to loyalty a certain amount of territory which remained under their control in the distant south. The revolution that followed immediately loosened the hold of the Muhammadans in the south, at least cut off communication between the headquarters and the distant Muhammadan garrison in Madura. Although Muhammad Tughlak was compelled to retire from Warangal in A.D. 1328, he sent out an invasion to Ma'bar which appears to have successfully reasserted the authority of Delhi in Madura.

We have coins of Muhammad Tughlak among those found in Madura bearing the dates equivalent to A.D. 1330, 1333 and 1334, a clear indication of the recognition of the authority of the Delhi Sultan in the distant south.* The coins of Jalalu-d-din Aḥsan Shah so far available to us bear the equivalent of A.D. 1335, as the earliest date. This could be held to mark the date of his successful rebellion.†

*There is a Tamil inscription in the as yet unpublished collection at Pudukōṭṭa referring itself to the 9th year of *Muhammad Suratana* (Sultan Muhammad). The record is in the *Gñānapurīśvara* Temple at Panaiyūr in the Tirumeyyan Taluk of Pudukōṭṭa, and refers to the *settlement of a dispute without the interposition of Government or Royal Officers.*

†There is another inscription in the Pudukōṭṭa collection at Rāngiam referring itself to Ādi Sultan's year 732, apparently the Hegira year, with details of date, the equivalent of Monday, March 9, A. D. 1332. Ādi Sultan is in all likelihood Muhammad; but it is barely possible it referes to Jalalu-d-din who must have become governor of Ma'bar in this year.

According to Ibn Batuta, Muhammad appointed Sheriff Jalalu-d-din Aḥsan Shah to be Governor of "the country of Malabar, which is at a distance of six months' journey from Delhi. The Jalalu-d-din rebelled, usurped the ruling power, killed the lieutenants and agents of the sovereign, and struck in his own name gold and silver money." * The details which he gives of the legends upon the coins make it quite certain that this is the Jalalu-d-din Aḥsan Shah of the Madura coins, which give the date, A.D. 1335, of the earliest known coins in his own name, as was pointed out above. This has to be noted carefully as it invalidates altogether the chronology of Ferishta. According to him this date would be about seven years later, namely, A.D. 1341. † It is the Aḥsan Shah that both Barani and Ferishta refer to as Syed, Hasan and Hussun, respectively. Jalalu-d-din Aḥsan Shah apparently overthrew the army sent by the Sultan Muhammad and declared himself independent in the next few years when he felt certain that Muhammad was not likely to march upon him himself, owing perhaps to the rebellions of Bahau-d-din and the resistance of Kampli which gave the rebel asylum. Ibn Batuta knew Jalalu-d-din as he had married one of the Sheriff's daughters, and was the friend of the Sheriff's son Ibrahim, the purse bearer of the Emperor Muhammad. When Muhammad heard of the rebellion, Ibrahim was sawn in two by Muhammad's order for the rebellion of the father. This Aḥsan Shah was murdered by one of his nobles in A.D. 1340, and was succeeded by Alau-d-din Udauji, another of the officers of Jalalu-d-din. This Udauji ruled for about a year. At the

* Elliott III., p. 618.

† Brigg's Ferishta, Vol. I, p. 23, Calcutta Ed. of Cambray.

end of it, after a successful battle with the Hindus (infidels), when he removed his helmet to drink water, he was shot dead on the spot by an arrow from an unknown hand. He was succeeded by a son-in-law of his who assumed the title Quṭb-ud-din. He was killed in forty days, and was succeeded by Ghiyathu-d-din Dhāmaghāni, originally a trooper in the service of the Delhi Sultan. He had subsequently married one of the daughters of Aḥsan Shah, and became a brother-in-law of Ibn Batuta. While Ibn Batuta was in South India on his way to China on the mission on which he was despatched by Muhammad in A.D. 1342, he met with an accident on the seas, and was hospitably received by this brother-in-law of his who, at the time, was engaged in a campaign against the infidels near "Harekatu" of Ibn Batuta (identified with Arcot by the translator). Ghiyathu-d-din sent a party to receive Ibn Batuta and take him to his camp. Ibn Batuta gives some interesting details of Ghiyathu-d-din's doings which throw a lurid light upon the character of Muhammadan rule in the South. While Ibn Batuta accompanied him, when he moved from the camp towards the capital, he happened to fall in with a number of "idolators" with their women and children in clearing a road through the forest. He made them carry a number of stakes sharpened at both ends, and when morning broke he divided these prisoners into four groups, and led one party to each gate of the four entrances to the camp. The stakes that they carried were then driven into the ground at one end and the unfortunate wretches were impaled alive thereon. Their wives and children had their throats cut and left fastened to the posts. Ibn Batuta exclaims in horror "it was for this reason that God hastened

the death of Ghiyathu-d-din." It is hardly necessary to add, to this bloodcurdling story, others from Ibn Batuta.

His wars against of Hoysalas.—The Muhammadans could not have been left in peace, and there appears to have been ceaseless petty warfare particularly on the frontier. Ibn Batuta mentions a great victory that his host gained over "Bilal Deo" (Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III). This last great Baḷḷāḷa had at least three capitals—Dvārasamudra in Mysore, Kundāṇi in Salem, and Tiruvaṇṇāmalai in Noth Arcot. During the last fifteen years of his reign he was constantly in the last place, the reason for which being apparently the predatory activities of these southern Muhammadans, and the need for protection along this frontier. Tiruvaṇṇāmalai is on the main line of communication between Madura and the North. According to Ibn Batuta, Baḷḷāḷa aimed at the conquest of the whole of the Coromandel Coast, and was able to put into the field a hundred thousand men not counting about twenty thousand Muhammadans whose services he enlisted. As against this, according to him, the Muhammadans had about six thousand troops of which half were worthless. "The conflict began at the town of Kabban,* and the Hindus routed their enemies who retreated to Mutrah (Madura) their Capital." The Baḷḷāḷa encamped close to the former place, which is described as one of the chief strongholds of the Muhammadans, and invested the place closely. Finding it impossible to defend themselves any longer the garrison asked for terms, and the Hoysala king offered to let them return to Madura under a safe conduct if they surrendered the town. He gave them

* Kaṇṇanūr-Koppam near Śrīrangam.

also a fortnight's respite to send to the headquarters and obtain permission. On receipt of this information which was read out in the Mosque in the presence of all who had assembled for prayer, the Muhammadans in Madura thought that the surrender of this fortress on any terms would be followed by their own destruction, and resolved to make an effort at raising the siege. They therefore secretly marched against the Hindu camp and threw the besieging army into confusion and ultimate flight. The old sovereign, who was about eighty years at the time according to Ibn Batuta, endeavoured to mount a horse and escape when he was taken prisoner by Nasiru-d-din, the nephew of the Sultan of Madura. He was about to kill the old man, not having recognised him, when a slave in attendance exclaimed 'it is the king.' "Whereupon he (the Ballāḷa) was taken prisoner and treated with apparent consideration; and, whilst under promise of eventual release, all his riches were extorted from him. He was then murdered and his skin stuffed with straw and hung from the walls of Mutrah (Madura), where Ibn Batuta says he saw it suspended."* This was the lamentable fate of the last great king of that dynasty. This event must have taken place just before the last known year of Ghiyathu-d-din, because soon after his return to Madura he lost his only son, his wife and his mother, by an attack of cholera, and himself died a fortnight later "from the effects of an aphrodisiac prepared by a Yogi." All these events had taken place before Ibn Batuta left Madura in the reign of his successor Nasiru-d-din.†

---

* Madras Journal of Literature and Science for 1888-89, p. 53.

† For the whole of this, see Ibn Batuta French Trans. by C. Defremery and B. R. Sanguinetti IV, pp. 185—200.

The Sultans of Madura subsequent to Ibn Batuta's departure.—This series of transactions took place between the years A.D. 1342 when Ibn Batuta was despatched from Delhi on his mission to China, and A.D. 1344 when finally he embarked for China from the port of Fatan (*Paṭṭaṇam*). The last known inscriptional date for Baḷḷāḷa III is 1342. He died about the end of that year.* Ghiyathu-d-din following in the course of a few weeks. Ghiyathu-d-din was succeeded by his nephew Nasiru-d-din who is said to have been a domestic servant at Delhi wherefrom he fled to his uncle Ghiyathu-d-din, soon after he became king. He obtained the consent of the nobles and the army for his accession by a lavish distribution of gold. Ibn Batuta himself received three hundred pieces of gold and a robe of honour. Almost the first act of Nasiru-d-din's was the killing of a son of his own paternal aunt, because he happened to be the husband of Ghiyathu-d-din's daughter. Having murdered the husband he married the widowed princess. It was in this reign that Ibn Batuta was provided with a number of ships to proceed on his journey. He embarked at Fatan (*Paṭṭaṇam*) again, paid a short visit to the Maldives and Honawar, and set forward from there on a voyage taking Bengal, Sumatra and Java on the way to China ultimately. The only available coin of Nasiru-d-din is dated A.H. 745 which would correspond to A. D. 1343. Then follows a break in the coins till we come upon one of Adil Shah with date A. H. 757 corresponding to A. D. 1356-57 or 1357-58. He was followed in A.H. 761 by Fakru-d-din Mubarak Shah for whom we have a number of coins

* The 8th Sep. 1342 is the date of his death according to Kd. 75 Epi. Car. VI

bearing dates from A.H. 761 to 770. Then came the last of the Sultans, Allau-d-din Sikandar Shah whose coins bear dates A. H. 774-779. This find of coins of the Sultans of Madura* so far available gives us the history of Madura under the Muhammadans, meagre as it is. But it is well supplemented by Ibn Batuta for the greater part of the period. The dates of these coins range from A.D. 1335 to A.D. 1377-78 with what seems a comparatively large gap from 1344-1357, almost corresponding to the period of active rule of the Bahmani Sultan Allau-d-din I. What this gap might mean will appear later. The power of the Muhammadans in Madura appears to have come definitely to an end about 1377-78, the last year of the Vijayanagar ruler Bukka.

Muhammadan Dynasties of Madura.—It is this dynasty of the Sultans of Madura which flourished in the period A.D. 1335 to A.D. 1378, a period of about 45 years, that has been confounded with the succession list given by Nelson in the Manual of the Madura country, and adopted therefrom by Mr. Sewell in his Antiquities of the Madras Presidency, Volume II. Quite recently the reports of the Epigraphist to the Madras Government adopt the same scheme also.†

An examination of the list given both in Nelson and Sewell shows that the dynasty began with Adi Sultan Malik Nemi on the authority of the Mackenzie Manuscripts—one of those documents based on the local accounts obtained and

* For this, refer to Dr. E. Hultzsch's article in the J.R.A.S. 1909. This supersedes previous contributions by Rodgers and others.

† Report for 1916, Sec. 33, p. 126.

recorded by Colonel Mackenzie's staff early in the nineteenth century. Of the six names that follow, it is possible to identify two or three with the Sultans of the coins of Madura whose history I have detailed above. The last three or four names seem not possible to recover or to equate satisfactorily. Adopting this list from Sewell, the Muhammadan dynasty is made to begin in A.D. 1310 and come to an end 48 years after in A.D. 1358. This arrangement, it is hardly necessary to point out, is untenable since the discovery of the coins of Madura and their study. No Muhammadan dynasty of Madura could be held to begin earlier than A.D. 1335* and the dynasty lasted till A.D. 1378 according to these coins with a rather wide gap from 1345 to 1357. Further criticism of Nelson's list would be superfluous.

The Hoysalas during the period.—During the period of active rule of this dynasty, the Hoysala ruler was Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III, who ascended the throne in A.D. 1292 and continued to rule till A.D. 1342. During the last 20 years of his reign he had to be very active on the Tamil frontier. We have already pointed out that in 1316 he had restored his capital of Dvārasamuda so far that he is said to have been ruling in great happiness† at his ancestral capital. This rebuilding of the capital by the Hoysala exhibits the advantage that was taken by the Hindu rulers of the south, of the confusion that prevailed at headquarters before Mubarak made his position secure on the throne at Delhi. We do not hear much of Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III from inscriptional

* Refer to note regarding the 9th year of Muhammad, p. 16.

† Md. 100. Epi. Car. III.

sources till A.D. 1328–29, the year in which Muhammad-bin-Tughlak sent an invasion to the south after his own abortive expedition to Warangal. In spite of the rebuilding of his capital, the Hoysala does not figure either in the organization of the Mahratta country by Mubarak and the placing of Muhammadan garrisons in the various forts along the Hoysala frontier, or in the subsequent invasions of Ma'bar (Tamil country) by Khusru Khan. He probably was able to reorganize his resources quietly and unobserved. It was possibly about this time that he went father afield from Dvārasamudra and laid the foundations of the city generally called *Hosapaṭṭaṇa* or *Virūpākshapaṭṭaṇa*, which ultimately became Vijayanagar, to secure his northern frontier. In the year A.D. 1328–29 * we hear of Vīra Baḷḷāḷa for the first time at *Uṇṇāmulai Paṭṭaṇam* (Tiruvaṇṇāmalai).† He was ruling in peace and happiness at the same place in A.D. 1342. In the meanwhile one record of his states that in A.D. 1339 (Śaka 1261) he was ruling in happiness in *Śrī Vīra Vijaya Virūpākshapura* as his residential capital (*Nelēviḍu*). He is further described in this record as the sole monarch by his own valour. ‡ In the following year a grant refers to the "*paṭṭābhishēka* of the prince" while Vīra Baḷḷāḷa was ruling.§ This is apparently a reference to the coronation of the prince which, according to a

* Db. XIV. Epi. Car. IX.

† It must be noted that the two names are not the same though they both refer to the same place. The first means "lady of unsucked breast" a name of Pārvati. The second means the hill unreachable. These are respectively the names of the Goddess and the God.

‡ Hoskote 43 Epi. Car. IX.

§ Bn. 111, Epi. Car. IX.

Chikkamagaḷūr inscription, is said to have taken place at *Hosapaṭṭaṇa.* There is an inscription in the temple at Hampi referring itself to the Hoysalas,* indicating thereby that Hampi was in the territory of the Hoysalas. There is further an inscription of A.D. 1354 (Śaka 1276) which states that Bukka was ruling from *Hosapṭṭaṇa.* The next year he is said to be in *Vidyānagara*, his capital. This series of facts would put it beyond doubt that *Hosapaṭṭaṇa* and *Vidyānagara* are the same as *Virūpākshapaṭṭaṇa* or Hampi, and that this had been recently fortified against eventualities sometime in or before A.D. 1139 † by the Hoysala Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III himself. It is clearly stated in another record of Bukka that it is by the conquest of all the kingdoms that Bukka changed the name of his capital city to Vijayanagar ‡. It would be a safe inference, therefore, to make from this sequence of facts that Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III was apparently preparing himself for possible campaigns both on the northern frontier and on the southern, and had his son anointed against eventualities, though this could only have meant the anointment of the prince in the *yauvarājya* (heir-apparentcy) as Vīra Baḷḷāḷa is definitely stated to be ruling. The next year a record from Mālūr gives Vīra Baḷḷāḷa his full titles, and among them is one which ascribes to him the setting up of a pillar of victory at the beginning of "the bridge" at Rāmēśvaram (*sētu*

* A.S.R. 1907-08, p. 236, note 2.

† Mr. Rice notes the date as 1329 on page 107 of Mysore and Coorg from Inscriptions. It is obviously an error as Śaka 1261 cannot be A.D. 1329.

‡ *Vijitya Viśvam Vijayābhidānām Viśvōttaram yo nagarīm Vijadatta.* Cn. 156 of A.D. 1378. Epi. Car. V.

mūla jayastambha).* This would be of date A.D. 1342 (April-May). The next year (the Śaka year) he is said to be fighting at Trichinopoly against the Muhammadans. This statement is found clearly enough in a *Vīragal* (hero-stone) at a village in the Kadur district. It was a stone set up to honour of a *gauḍa* Kankayya who fell in battle with the Muhammadans "and went to heaven along with the king." The stone was actually set up in Śaka 1290 in the year Plavanga, but the actual occurrence of the death, referred to in the record,† is stated to have taken place in the year *Chitrabhānu* preceding, *Asvayuja'* Su. 8 (a date corresponding to A.D., 8th September 1342). But the most important point in the reading of this inscription is the place. I was able to examine the inscription through the kindness of Rao Bahadur R. Narasimhacharyar, Director of Archæological Researches in Mysore, and the reading is *Chirichirāpali*. It is only the letter "ra" that is worn in the first half, but there is little doubt that it is "ra." The whole word, therefore, is a Kannaḍa pronunciation of Trichinopoly, which must be the locality of the battle in which Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III fell.‡

We have a more or less circumstantial account of this transaction from Ibn Batuta who was in the country at the time, and was in Madura soon after. The battle took place

* Mr. 82 Epi. Car. X.

† Kd. 75. Epi. Car. VI.

‡ Mr. Rice has wrongly read the name as Beribi (Mysore and Coorg from Inscriptions, p. 108.) This error is found in the translation of Kd. 75. Epi. Car. VI. The transliteration, gives it as *Chīri-chi-paliyalu*. The Kannaḍa version gives it *Chirichi-pali*. Hence the difficulty and the need for verification.

apparently as was stated already between Ghiyathu-d-din, the Sultan of Madura and a relative of Ibn Batuta, and Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III. But Ibn Batuta calls the place of battle Cobban, the nearest South Indian equivalent of which could be only Koppam. With this particular record of Vīra Baḷḷāḷa before us we must of necessity look out for a Koppam of some strategical importance to have become the scene of such constant wars between the Muhammadans and the Hoysalas. Luckily for us we have a reference to a Koppam in an inscription of *Jatāvarman* Sundara Pāṇḍya I. In the preamble to this inscription* he refers to the place Kaṇṇanūr as *Kaṇṇanūr-Koppam.* And this is apparently the Koppam or Cobban of Ibn Batuta. In connection with this identification it must be borne in mind that, according to the account of this Muhammadan traveller who certainly did know what he was describing, this Cobban was a place of vital strategical importance; for, according to him, if Cobban fell, the position of the Muhammadans in Madura would have become impossible. To this description Kaṇṇanūr would answer very well. That Kaṇṇanūr passed into the possession of the Muhammadans either during the invasion of Malik Kafur himself, or in the interval between that and this last battle is clear as the place which was the capital of Vīra Rāmanātha, and perhaps even his son, to the time of accession of Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III, does not find mention in any of the records of this Vīra Baḷḷāḷa. The change of capital to Tiruvaṇṇāmalai in 1328 as we know it, it might have been much earlier, finds an explanation in this that Kaṇṇanūr must have been lost to the Hoysalas before that period and must have been the base of active operations

* Sen Tamil, Vol. 4, p. 515.

against the Hoysala territory in the Tamil country. It is as a counter-work to the Muhammadan position in Kaṇṇanūr which is on the trunk road leading from the north to Madura that Tiruvaṇṇāmalai must have been pitched upon as the capital of the Hoysalas. Tiruvaṇṇāmalai connects with the Hoysala capitals *Kundāṇi* and *Dvārasamudra*, on the one hand, and with Kaṇṇanūr on the other, and is certainly well situated for preventing reinforcements reaching the Muhammadans from the north. The distance between Trichinopoly and Kaṇṇanūr is only about 8 or 9 miles at the best, and if anything like a large army of 100,000 operated on the side of the Hoysalas, as Ibn Batuta clearly states that that was the strength of the army, that distance between the two camps would be even necessary.* The town Trichinopoly is referred to by that name, although not yet found in inscriptional records, in the Tēvāram of Śambandar in the seventh century A.D. and is referred to as the headquarters of a small division, *Tiruchirāpaḷḷi Uśāvaḍi*,† under Dēvarāya I in the fifteenth century. There is the probability that the place is referred to by this name in the fourteenth century in a Pudukōṭṭa Inscription of the eighth year of Tribhuvanachakravartin Parākrama Pāṇḍya which contains a signature *Tiruchirāpaḷḷi Uḍaiyān.* Hence it is clear that the Cobban of Ibn Batuta is no other than Kaṇṇanūr, and it is in that vicinity that the last battle of Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III was fought.

About 11 months after this event we have a record executing a grant on the occasion of the coronation of the

* Consult Orme's Early Campaigns of the British in this locality, or better Mr. Hemingway's Trichinopoly Gazetteer.

† Ep. Rep. for 1914, Sec. 27.

Hoysala prince by *Baḷḷappa Daṇṇāyaka*. This Baḷḷappa figures several times in the records of Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III, and it is just possible that he was "the son-in-law of the Baḷḷāḷa" of the Kolar records. In this grant which is dated Śaka 1265 Svabhānu, sometime in A.D. 1343 (July-August), Vīra Baḷḷāḷa is not mentioned as ruler and we are therefore led to infer that this time it is the anointment of the prince as sovereign. The last record of this new ruler who might, for convenience, be named Baḷḷāḷa IV, or *Virūpāksha Baḷḷāḷa*, is one dated the following Vyaya which refers itself to the time of Baḷḷāḷarāya. This would be the equivalent of A.D. 1346–47, and we hear no more of the Hoysalas after this date.

Ibn Batuta in South India.—It was during this period that the Algerian traveller Ibn Batuta, who entered India in A.D. 1333 and resided in the court of Sultan Muhammad for about 10 years, stayed some time in South India in the course of his embassy to China on behalf of the Emperor. Sultan Muhammad received an embassy from China requesting permission to repair or rebuild some temple in a place called Sambhal, probably the one in Eastern Rājaputāna. The Sultan declined permission on the ground that, under the Muhammadan Law, it was not permissible to allow the erection of heretical temples unless those that wish to build them paid the *Jiziya* (poll-tax on infidels). If the "Celestial Emperor" would agree to put himself on those terms Muhammad would have no objection to grant the permission. Ibn Batuta, with the necessary paraphernalia of the mission, started from Delhi and proceeded across India to the coast of Konkan, wherefrom he proceeded along the coast by way of Goa, but took

ship for Calicut at a port called Kandahar. He halted at Honawar (Hinur) where he remained a guest of Sultan Jamalu-d-din Muhammad. After a three days' sail from there he reached the island Sindabur ; therefrom he set forward on the two months' march along the coast to Kulam (Quilon). He had to pass through the territory of "the twelve Sultans of Malabar," passing through the towns of Abusah and Fakanur. He came to Mangalore after a three days' sail from the latter place. The next important port that he touched at was Hili (near Cannanore) which at the time was one of the three ports of call for the Chinese merchants on the Malabar coast, namely, Hili, Calicut and Kulam. Starting again from there, he passed Jarfattan and two other coast towns, Dahfattan and Budfattan, till he reached Fandaraina. Starting thence he reached Calicut where the embassy was to take ship on its voyage to China. There happend to be at the time in this port 13 Chinese vessels composed of the three kinds, large ships or *Junks* ; the middle-sized ones called *Zan*, and the small ones known as *Kakams*. Each junk was manned by 600 sailors and carried 400 warriors. They contained decks, cabins, saloons and holds for merchandise. Each oar of these ships was worked by 15 men, and every junk was accompanied by three of the smaller craft. Three of these ships were set apart for the imperial mission, and before all of the men could embark all the junks had to leave the port owing to stress of weather, and several of them suffered shipwreck. Ibn Batuta who remained on the shore was left there and the *Kakam* containing all his belongings set sail as soon as it saw the fate that had overtaken the fleet as a whole. Ibn Ba tuta hearing that the *Kakam* would put in at Kulam

started towards the place by the river-way and reached Kulam in safety in 10 days. He found it a handsome town frequented by Chinese merchants, the port being most conveniently situated for them. The town was under its Hindu ruler. He there met the Chinese envoys who had travelled down from Delhi and who had also suffered shipwreck in the voyage. Giving up the idea of returning to Delhi which he entertained for a little while, he accepted the advice of an imperial agent at Calicut and proceeded to Honawar, where he was the respected guest of the Sultan. He took part in an expedition against the Island of Sindabur which was ultimately conquered by the Sultan of Honawar. While there, he learnt from two of his slaves who managed to return to India that all his property including his slaves were taken possession of by others and had been dispersed over Java, China and Bengal. Notwithstanding this depressing news, he returned to Sindabur as he promised, and, as disturbances broke out there again, he left the place and reaching Calicut resolved to pay a visit to the Maldive islands. There he stayed for some time and contracted relations that made his departure difficult. Finally he managed to obtain permission to depart. He then paid a visit to Ceylon, where landing at Puttalam he found the Indian chieftain Āriya Chakravarti in possession of the locality who received him kindly and conversed with him in Persian. Through his good offices and with the escort provided by him he paid a visit to Adam's Peak, and returned to Puttalam. He started from there for Ma'bar, and in the course of his voyage, he suffered shipwreck. While he had almost given himself up for lost, some native inhabitants of the coast

near about rescued him from this perilous position. On reaching ashore he sent word to the Sultan of Ma'bar, Ghiyathu-d-din who had married a sister of one of the wives that Ibn Batuta had married in Delhi. But Ghiyathu-d-din was at the time engaged in the siege of a place called Harikattu, wherefrom he sent an escort to fetch Ibn Batuta. Ibn Batuta arrived in camp on the second day. What Ibn Batuta saw there, and what he really has to say about the doings of Ghiyathu-d-din, we have alredy related in part before. He was a cruel monarch engaged constantly in war against the Hindus under the Hoysala monarch Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III. In addition to the single instance of cruelty given there, Ibn Batuta details other instances. Ibn Batuta persuaded the Sultan to fit out an expedition for the conquest of the Maldive islands and was himself entrusted with the commission. This had to stand over for some time as the chief admiral, Khojah Sarlak as he is called, insisted that it would take at least three months to fit out the expedition, during which time Ibn Batuta had no alternative but to wait. In the meanwhile was fought the decisive battle of Cobban, as Ibn Batuta calls it, and the death of the family of Ghiyathu-d-din and himself followed soon after. Under his successor Nasiru-d-din, Ibn Batuta stayed for a short time in Madura. It was then that he insisted upon returning in spite of the fact that the fleet of Khojah Sarlak was not yet ready. Nasiru-d-din issued orders to place such ships as were available in the port of Fatan at his disposal. Ibn Batuta reached Fatan and took ship there to the Maldives back again on his way to Calicut and Honawar; from Calicut he took ship again and this time he had a prosperous voyage till he reached Bengal. What is

of importance to South Indian History is that he left Delhi early in 1342 and left Fatan some time in 1343-44; and what he relates of South India has reference to this particular period. We have already seen, on the authority of the inscription on the *Vīragal* in the Kadur district, that Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III died on the 8th of September 1342. Ghiyathu-d-din's death must have followed in the next few months, that is, about the end of the year or early in the next. We have coins of Ghiyathu-d-din of date A.H. 745 the equivalent of which, in Christian era, would be A.D. 1344. It must be in the course of that year 1344 that he left Madura for Fatan and took his departure from Calicut in the following year for China.

Break in the Coinage of the Sultans of Madura, A.D. 1343–4 to 1355–6.—To return to the Sultans of Madura; we have coins of Nasiru-d-din, the successor of Ghiyathu-d-din, only of date A.H. 745. That would mean A.D. 1344. From that date to A.H. 757 there is a break in the coinage for an interval of about 12 years. It would be rather difficult to believe that this is due to a mere accident. We have already stated that between the Sultans of Madura and the Hoysalas there were constant wars along the Kaveri-Coleroon frontier—the same frontier on which the Pāṇḍyas and the Hoysalas had constantly to fight in the period immediately preceding. The death of Vīra Baḷḷāḷa could not have put an end to this war. His successor Baḷḷāḷa IV must have continued the wars of his father for the next two or three years during which time he must have been ruling. The last inscriptional date we get for him is a date in A.D. 1346 as was already pointed out. It is just

possible that he also fell in fighting against the Sultans of Madura about that particular period, say, about A.D. 1345–6, that Muhammad-bin-Tughlak had involved himself in the greatest difficulties in his empire, and there was a famine if the chronology of the Muhammadan historians could be accepted without question. The Sultan Muhammad perpetrated the double blunder of recalling the capable Katlagh Khan from Deogir, and appointing the incompetent and unpopular slave Aziz Himar, Governor of Malva, whose perfidy to 'the foreign Amirs,' at the instance of the Sultan himself, created the rebellion in Gujarat which terminated only after the death of the Sultan. Nasarat Khan broke out in rebellion in Bidar and Einu-l-Mulk of Oudh followed near the imperial headquarters at Sarg-Dwari (*svarga-dvāra* or gate of heaven). It is to this date that the Muhammadan historians refer the rising in Telingana under Krishṇappa Nāyaka, * one of the sons of Pratāparudra II of Warangal. This series of rebellions all over the empire would not have been lost upon the more distant south. There is an inscription of date 1328 when a Māchaya Daṇṇāyaka was ruling at Penugoṇḍa as a subordinate of Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III. Somewhat later Ibn Batuta himself says that his friend at Honawar, Jamalu-d-din Muhammad, was the greatest Sultan in the West Coast. He was himself

---

* This was apparently the eldest son and successor of Pratāparudra who died according to Shamsi Siraj Afif on his way to Delhi whereto Muhammad sent him probably in A.D. 1328. (Elliott III, 367).

This is confirmed by a Telugu historical Manuscript Pratāpacharitam, according to which his death took place at Mantenna on the Godavari. This Mantenna is otherwise called Mantrakūṭa and figures in the inscriptions of Kākatīya Rudra I. (*Vide Anumakoṇḍa Ins.* Indian Antiquary XI. pp. 9-20)

subordinate to "an infidel king whose name is Horaib." This Horaib should be no other than Hariappa Uḍaiyār,* the eldest of the five brothers to whom is given the credit of having founded the empire of Vijayanagar. This must have been before A.D. 1344. The latest known date for this Harihara is A.D. 1346.† A record of date equal to A.D. 1352 (Śaka 1274)‡ refers to "Vīra Bukka Rāyalu, ruling at Dhorasamudra and Penugoṇḍa." The same grant refers to Bukka as an "elevator of the Hoysala empire." It would be difficult to regard this position of Bukka as having been achieved in a very short time, and by a person unconnected with the Hoysala administration. There is one other fact which exhibits a similar tendency and which must be noted here. In the early wars of Allau-d-din Bahmani when he marched south from Daulatabad atter the death of Muhammad bin Tughlak he met on the southern frontier, and therefore the more uncertain frontier of his, one Hindu chieftain by name Harib in the region of the Konkan coast up to Jamkhaṇḍi. A little further to the east of it between Bijapur and Gulbarga figures another Hindu chief by name Kapras; and further east another Hindu chieftain still of the name Kampraz. This has reference to the year A. D. 1352. These three Hindu chieftains are obviously no other than Hariappa (Harib), Bukkappa Razu (Kapraz), and Kampa Razu (Kampaṇa), the three elder of the five brothers to whom inscriptions of the time ascribe the foundation of

* A record recently published by Prof. Moraes in the Bombay University Journal makes this Hariappa a West Coast ruler.

† A.S.R. 1907-08. p. 236 and Refs. in Note 7.

‡ Epi. Rep. for 1918. Sec. 47.

the empire of Vijayanagar ; the two other brothers Muddappa and Marappa are found just behind this front line. One of them was the viceroy obviously under Hariappa of the Malē and Tuḷu Rājya with his capital at Āraga in the Shimoga district of Mysore, and the other was in charge of Muḷbāgal Mahārājya in the south-eastern corner of Mysore, and fronting the Tamil country. This series of facts that emerge from a scrutiny of the inscriptional records of the period leads necessarily to the inference that the wars were still going on, and the kingdom of the Hoysala had to fight on the two sides, of which the northern side exhibits to us this impenetrable wall of garrisons under the five brothers, fighting to stem the new flood of Bahmani invasions and keep it within its bounds.

The explanation of the break in the coinage of the Sultans of Madura :—What actually did take place in the same period on the southern frontier is not equally clear ; but a record at Tirukaḷākkuḍi referring itself to the 31st year of a Māravarman Vīra Pāṇḍya, which gives details of date to equate it satisfactorily, refers to the conquest of the Muhammadans in the south by Kumāra Kampaṇa, the son of the 3rd of the five brothers Bukka. This record states " the times were Tulukkan (Muhammadan) times ; the *dēvadāna* (gifts to gods) lands of the gods were taxed with *Kuḍimai* (dues of cultivation) ; the temple worship, however, had to be conducted without any reduction ; the *uḻavu* or cultivation of the temple lands was done by turns by the tenants of the village ; at this juncture Kampaṇa Uḍaiyār came on his southern campaigns, destroying Tulukkans, established a stable administration throughout the country and appointed many

chiefs (Nāyakkanmār) for inspection and supervision in order that the worship in all temples might be revived regularly as of old."* The date of this record from the astronomical details given has been equated with A.D. 1358 (Friday, September 7). If by 1358 all this had been done by Kumāra Kampaṇa and there is no particular reason to doubt the record, then the invasion by Kampaṇa of the south must have taken place somewhat earlier. Does this not offer the explanation of the break in the coinage of the Sultans of Madura? If it does, it means that the Vijayanagar invasions had taken place during this period, and either the Madura Sultan Nasiru-d-din himself (or his successor) suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of the Hindus and the rule of the Muhammadans was put an end to, at least temporarily. Its revival about this time, A.D. 1355-56, in Madura must be a comparatively faint effort, and when even that nominal rule in Madura was put an end to some time in A.D. 1375-6, the time had arrived for the Vijayanagar ruler Harihara II to announce himself formally to the world as the 'emperor of the south.'

In this connection, there are two records found in the temple of Tiruppattūr, now in the Ramnad district, which refer themselves to the 44th and 46th years of a Jaṭāvarman Tribhuvana Chakravartin Vīra Pāṇḍya Dēva, which refer to these Muhammadan invasions also, and throw a certain amount of light upon the history of the period. The Jaṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya of these records is undoubtedly the Vīra Pāṇḍya against whom Malik Kafur undertook his invasions of the south. The Śiva temple at Tiruppattūr

* Epi. Rep. 1916, Sec. 33.

is said in one of these records to have been in the 'occupation of the encamped Muhammadans whose time it was,' and in consequence to have been ruined. In this condition a certain *Viśaiyālaya Dēvar of Śūraikkuḍi*, otherwise Ariyan Periyanāyanar reconsecrated the temple. Out of gratitude for this pious act of his, by which the people imagined they were saved from some impending calamity, they assigned to him a specified quantity of corn from the harvest reaped by every individual each year, and conferred on him also certain privileges in the temple.* All this took place in the 44th year of the Pāṇḍya referred to above. According to the calculations of the late Professor Kielhorn and confirmed by those of Mr. Swamikannu Pillai, this Vīra Pāṇḍya ascended the throne in A.D. 1296-97, and the reconsecration of the Tiruppattūr temple must have therefore reference to the year A.D. 1340, when apparently Vīra Pāṇḍya was still alive, and his authority was recognised in this part of the country. The other record referring to this event is of a date two years later, that is A.D. 1342. It will be well to remember in this connection that the years 1340-42 were the years in which the Hoysala Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III made a serious effort at hemming in the Muhammadans into Madura with a view ultimately to turn them out of the place. It is an inscription of A.D. 1340, as was pointed out already, that lays claim to his having erected a pillar of victory at "the root" (Sētumūla) of Adam's Bridge. It must also be noted that it is about the end of the year A.D. 1342 that he died as the result of a battle at

* This family of Śūraikkuḍi chiefs played an important part in the period and that immediately following, as there are a number of records of these in the Pudukōṭṭa collection.

Kaṇṇanūr. The Tiruppattūr records indicate that he was in the main so successful in the effort that even restoration work could be undertaken. The statement of Ibn Batuta that this Hindu ruler wanted to take the whole of Ma'bar is thus justified.

It was apparently after the death of this Vīra Baḷḷāḷa, and possibly after that of his son, that the chieftain brothers who took upon themselves the responsibility of clearing South India of the Muhammadans should have continued the policy of the last Hoysalas. It is worth remarking in this connection that the wars of Kumāra Kampaṇa, the son of Bukka, detailed in the *Kamparāya Charitam of Gangādēvi* may have to be brought in into this interval A.D. 1343 to A.D. 1355-56. The two enemies against whom Kamparāya won victories were the Śambuvarāyans of the North Arcot and Chingleput districts, and the Sultan of Madura. Without going into full details, this poem and several other works, Telugu and Sanskrit, state it indubitably that Kampaṇa and his colleagues in the campaign did overthrow one Śambuvarāyan, and restored the kingdom to another taking the title *Śambuvarāya* (or Sans. Champurāya) *Sthāpanāchārya* (he that established Śambuvarāya in his position). It must also be remembered that the kingdom of these chieftains is called Rājagambhīra Rājyam.* This Rājagambhīra Rājyam was hitherto taken to mean either the Pāṇḍya country because a certain Pāṇḍya assumed the title, or the Chōḻa country because a Chōḻa king, at a slightly earlier period, had assumed this title. But it now turns out to be neither. The name of the

* Tirupputkuli Inscription of A.D. 1365, No. 18 of 1899.

kingdom seems to be derived from the hill fortress which was its citadel, and which apparently refers to *Paḍaivīḍu* in the Arni Jaghir. This is not all. One of the predecessors of this Śambuvarāyan called himself Rājagambhīra Śambuvarāyan* in an inscription of A.D. 1268 in Paḍaivīḍu itself. The epic of Gangādēvi refers to the siege of the hill Rājagambhīraṁ in the course of the war,† thus making it clear that the Rājagambhīra Rājyam was no other than the kingdom of the Śambuvarāyans. It looks very probable that it was Sakalaloka Chakravartin *Venṛu Maṇgoṇḍa Śambuvarāyan* whose date of accession is Śaka 1245 (A.D. 1322–23) that was overthrown by Kampaṇa some time about A.D. 1347, which is the first date of his successor Sakalaloka Chakravartin Rāja Nārāyaṇa Śambuvarāyan. This achievement of Kumāra Kampaṇa must have followed close upon the disappearance of the last Hoysala Baḷḷāḷa IV, either by natural death or otherwise, as his last date is 1346. It is in this campaign that he is taken further as far as Madura, where he overthrew in actual battle, and killed, the Sultan of Madura. Among the attributes given to this Sultan by the poetess is one, which seems to mean much more than meets the eye. He is described to be "one who reduced to a low condition the Chōḷa and Pāṇḍya by his valour, who proved the hatchet to the creeper, the prosperity of the Baḷḷāḷa." ‡

---

* S. Ind. Ins. 1, 78 of Śaka 1180.

† Atha tasya purīmēva nītva śibiratām nṛpaḥ | *achalam Rājagambhīramarundat* dviṣa dāśṛtam ‖ Kamparāyacharitam IV, 32.

‡ Parākrama (dhaḥ) kṛta Chola Pāṇḍyaṁ
Vallāla sampallatikā kuṭhāram |
Ranonmukham Kampanṛpopiyanandit
Vīraḥ Suratrāṇamudagraśauryaḥ ‖

NOTE.—Instead of *dhaḥ*, (*nnyak*) is the MS. reading.
Kamparāyacharitam, Trivandrum Edn. p. 82.

This gives a clear indication that that was the man whose active existence in Madura was the cause of the destruction of the prosperity of the Hoysalas. This reference may be held directly to indicate that the particular Sultan who was responsible for the death of the Hoysala, was Sultan Nasiru d-din who succeeded his uncle Ghiyathu-d-din in A.D. 1343. There is only one date on his coins, as was pointed out already, and that is A.H. 745; and an interregnum of 12 years followed immediately after this date. It is this state of things that we seem to find an echo of in the Tarikh-i Firoz Shahi of Shams-i Siraj 'Afif. "While the Sultan was at Delhi, attending to the affairs of his kingdom, ambassadors arrived from Ma'bar to state a grievance to him. Kurbat Hasan Kangu was king in Ma'bar. When Sultan Muhammad Shah died, and Sultan Firoz succeeded, his edicts were sent into Ma'bar; but the people of that country rebelled, and, going to Daulatabad, they made Kurbat Kangu, king of Ma'bar. When this Kurbat held his court, he appeared decked out hand and foot with female ornaments, and made himself notorious for his puerile actions. The men of Ma'bar saw this, and, being greatly incensed against him, they rebelled. The neighbouring chief, named Bakan, at the head of a body of men and elephants, marched into Ma'bar and made Kurbat Hasan Kangu prisoner. He made himself master of all Ma'bar, which had belonged to the Muhammadans; their women suffered violence and captivity in the hands of the Hindus and Bakan established himself as ruler of Ma'bar." As his army was all along engaged in war and wanted rest, the Sultan declined to interfere according to this author. When some time after his army volunteered to go

for the conquest of Ma'bar, the Sultan was persuaded to decline to interfere again on the advice of his general Khani-Jahan who objected to going to war against Mussalmans. What is worth remarking in this extract is that notwithstanding the confusion in the name Kurbat Hasan Kangu and Daulatabad, the whole transaction seems to refer to what took place in the region of the Coromandel and not in the Dekhan. The puerile action the Sultan is charged with has not been ascribed to the founder of the Bahmani kingdom in any other account; and the whole matter has reference to what took place immediately after the death of Sultan Muhammad in A.D. 1351. By this time the five brothers who were the successors of the Hoysalas in their campaigns against the Muhammadans of Madura, had achieved all that is ascribed to the chief Bakan, who could be no other than the Bukka of Hindu historical records. So in the early fifties of the thirteenth century the Muhammadan power in South India suffered an eclipse from which it emerged, for a period of about 20 years, only to suffer extinction. When again that power was destroyed, the restoration of the country to the Hindus is signalised by the restoration of Śrīrangam to its ancient glory and greatness in A.D. 1370–71. This brings us to the end of Muhammadan rule in the south; and the assumption of imperial titles by the Vijayanagar ruler Harihara II comes in at a period when there was not the faintest chance of any recovery by the Muhammadans of their position in South India. It is the position of the Muhammadans in the South that explains what appears the inexplicable delay in the assumption of imperial titles by

these chieftains even when their possession of the South had become an accomplished fact.

NOTE.—For a fuller treatment of this subject and the various connected matters bearing on it consult my forthcoming work "South India and her Muhammadan Invaders".

(Lecture to the Mythic Society, October 1920. *Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society XI.*)

A little known Chapter of Vijayanagar History

Period : A. D. 1450–1509.

Doubts and difficulties in the subject.—The great Dēva Rāya II died in all probability in A.D. 1448–9 (or Śaka 1369) and was succeeded by his son Mallikārjuna, in the same year. The succession of Mallikārjuna, marks the beginning of decline, if not of Vijayanagar, at least of the dynasty which brought it to the prominent position that it occupied at the end of the first century of its existence. The following extract from Sewell's *Vijayanagar* will give an idea of the doubts and difficulties that beset the subject.

'I have already stated that the period following the reign of Dēva Rāya II is one very difficult to fill up satisfactorily from any source. It was a period of confusion in Vijayanagar—a fact that is clearly brought out by Nuniz in his chronicle.

A.D. 1449 is the last date in any known inscription containing mention of a Dēva Rāya and Dr. Hultzsch allots this to Dēva Rāya II. It may be, as alredy suggested, that there was a Dēva Rāya III, on the throne between A.D. 1444 and 1449, but this remains to be proved. Two sons of Dēva Rāya II, according to the inscriptions, were named Mallikārjuna and Virūpāksha I respectively. There are inscriptions of the former dated in A.D. 1452–3 and 1464-5

and one of the latter in 1470. Mallikārjuna appears to have had two sons, Rājaśēkara, of whom we have inscriptions in the years A.D. 1479–80 and 1486–7, and Virūpāksha II, mentioned in an inscription dated A.D. 1483–4, three years earlier than the last of Rājaśēkara.

Dr. Hultzsch, in the third volume of the *Epigraphia Indica*, p. 36, gives these dates, but in the fourth volume of the same work (p. 180) he notes that an inscription of Rājaśēkara exists at Ambur in North Arcot, which is dated in the year corresponding to A.D. 1468–9. I have also been told of an inscription on stone to be seen at the village of Parnapalle (or Paranapalle) in the Cuddapah district, of which a copy on copper plate is said to be in the possession of one Narayana Reddi of Goddamari in the Tadpatri Taluk of the Anantapur district. This is reported to bear date Śaka 1398 (A.D. 1476–7), and to mention as sovereign 'Prauḍha Dēva Rāya of Vijayanagar.'

Rājaśēkara's second inscription must have been engraved very shortly before the final fall of the old royal house, for the first certain date of the usurper Narasimha is A.D. 1490.

Amid this confusion of overlapping dates we turn for help to Nuniz; but though his story gathered from tradition about the year 1535, is clear and consecutive, it clashes somewhat with the other records. According to him, Dēva Rāya II had a son Pina Rāya, who died six months after his attempted assassination; but we have shown that Abdur Razak conclusively establishes that this unfortunate monarch was Dēva Rāya II himself and that the crime was

committed before the month of April 1443. Pina Rāya left a son unnamed, who did nothing in particular, and was succeeded by his son, 'Verūpāca', by which name Virūpāksha is clearly meant. Virūpāksha was murdered by his eldest son, who in turn was slain by his younger brother, 'Padea Rao', and this prince lost the kingdom to the usurper Narasimha.

Mallikārjuna, successor of Dēva Rāya II.—There seems to be no need to assume a Dēva Rāya III at all, and the account of Nuniz cannot be regarded accurate in regard to the details of the history of the period. There are a number of records of Mallikārjuna which make his position in respect of his predecessors clear. These further give the information that he had the name Dēva Rāya or more specifically Immaḍi Prauḍha (or Pratāpa) Dēva Rāya. Nagar 65 has it clearly

tayōḥ prāchīna puṇyānām paripāka viśēshataḥ
svīya janmāntraprāpta bhāgya bhōga phalāyahi
Mallikārjunadēvasya Śrīgirau sannivāsinaḥ
Varōtta-kṛta tannāma-kumārāḥ-samajāyata
pitariyuparatē śrīmān ḍhīraḥ paramadhārmikaḥ
Immaḍi (prauḍha) dēvēndro rājābhūt jagatīpatīḥ.

'to them (Dēva Rāya II and Ponnāla Dēvi) from the ripening of the merit of their good works in their previous lives, as the result of his own merits in a former existence, while the pair were in residence in the glorious hill of Mallikārjuna, the excellent son was born to whom was given the name of the God. When his father died, the valiant dutiful prince became king as Immaḍi Dēvēndra.'

tējo nidhēr ajani bhūmipatēr amnṣhmāch chrī Mallikārjuna iti prathitaḥ kumāraḥ
Sauryādhibhir guṇā-gaṇairadhikam cha tātāch cham santi-yam nṛipatim Immaḍi Dēva Rāyaḥ.

It is thus clear that Dēva Rāya II was succeeded after his death by his son Mallikārjuna and that he had the alternative name Dēva Rāya as well because he was regarded twice as valiant as his father. He assumed also the special attribute of the father 'the elephant-hunter'. As Mr. Sewell points out Ferishta has no wars against Vijayanagar to record between the years A.D. 1443 and 1458, the date of death of Sultan Allau-d-din of the Bahmani kingdom. With the death of this monarch, however, affairs in the Bahmani kingdom drift rapidly towards the disruption that was ultimately accomplished in the eighties of the fifteenth century.

Gangādāsapratāpavilāsam.—We gain, however, some light beating over the dark spot from an unlooked for source. In a drama known as *Gangādāsapratāpavilāsam* occurs a passage which may be rendered freely as follows :—

'While Pratāpa Dēva Rāya the Indra of Vijayanagar, with the various titles, usually ascribed to Dēva Rāya II, went to adorn the court of Indra (went to heaven or died), the throne of the kingdom was occupied *by his son Śrī Mallikārjuna.* Having heard this, the Sultan of the south and Gajapati made war upon him with an innumerable army of elephant, horse and foot. While they lay round Vijayanagar, Mallikārjuna quite unable to tolerate this sallied out of the fort, like a lion-cub from a mountain-cave upon a herd of elephants, and drowned the armies of

Hayapati and *Gajapati* in the flood caused by his sword. Both the Gajapati and the Yavanapati fled each by himself alone back to his kindom.'*

The following points deserve attention in this. The invasion of Vijayanagar took place as a result of the change of rulers. The Bahmani Sultan referred to as the southern Sultan, Hayapati (ruler of horse) and Yavanapati (Yavana

---

* Eggeling's Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office, Part vii, p. 1610.

गङ्गादासप्रतापविलासनाटके द्वितीयेऽङ्के नाट्यकारः—आकर्ण्यताम्, पूर्वपश्चिमदक्षिणसमुद्राधीश्वरे हयपतिगजपतिनरपतिरायसुवर्णपुत्तलाङ्कितवामचरणबिरुदतोडराडम्बरे महाराजाधिराजराजपरमेश्वरे राजकठारीत्रिनेत्रे राजराजवेटकारे रिपुराजगजगण्डभेरुण्डावतारे **विजयनगरीपुरन्दरे** श्री**मत्प्रतापदेवराजे** महेन्द्रसभालङ्कारे सति तत्कुमारेण श्री**मल्लिकार्जुनराजेन** साम्राज्यसिंहासनमधिष्ठितम्. तदाकर्ण्य **दक्षिणसुरत्राणेन गजपतिना** च पूर्वपराभूताभ्यामुभाभ्याममितहयगजपदातिभ्यां संभूयाभिषेणनमकारि। **विजयनगर**मावृत्य स्थितं तावदसहमानो गजबलं म्रगेन्द्रशाब इव गिरिकन्दराद् **विजयनगरतः** श्री**मल्लिकार्जुन**राजो **बहिर्निर्गत्य** निशिततरकरवालधाराजलप्रवाहवाहिनीपूरे **हय**पतिगजपतिसैन्यमशेषममजयत्। **गजपतिः** स्वदेहमात्रावशेषः पलाय्य निरगाद् **यवन**पतिश्च। तदनन्तरं श्री**मल्लिकार्जुनराजे**न रणद्यूतविजितान् हयगजान् सकलमहीमण्डलकलावत्करकमलसात्कृतवता तस्यामेववेलायां निजजनकेन श्री**प्रतापदेवराजेन** दिव्यरत्नरचितकटककुण्डलहारकनकदण्डचामरयुगलमौक्तिकच्छत्ररिपुराजगजगण्डभेरुण्ड निजबिरुदपदकहयगजनरपतिराजकविपुत्तलाङ्किते (तं) बिरुदतोडरं दत्वा निजकीर्तिजगङ्गाया भगीरथीकृत्य सम्मानितरुचिराङ्गधरो (संमा)ऽनवद्यविद्याबलेन दिग्विजयाय यातः संप्रति क्वास्त इति पृष्टम्। तदातदानीमेवोत्तरदिगन्तरालात्समागतेन केनचिद्वैतालिकेन

ruler) and the Gajapati (ruler of Orissa) were allied against Vijayanagar. The subject of the drama springs out of an heroic episode in one of the wars of the Sultan of Gujarat against a Hindu chief of Pāvāchalā * feudatory to him.

Professor Eggeling refers this war to the war of A.D. 1449. The invasion must have taken place soon after the accession of Mallikārjuna and should have been in the

---

महाराजस्य कीर्तिमाहिमाचलं कृत्वा द्वारकायात्रां विधायाह्मदाबादनगरे **गूर्जरसुरत्राणस्य** महाद्वारे वामचरणे बिरुदतोडरं निधाय सभाकोविदान्मूकीकृत्य षण्मासानुषित्वा ततो निर्गम्य **पावाचलाधीश्वरं** **चम्पकपुरपुरन्दरं** श्री**गङ्गदासभूवल्लभं** द्रष्टुं समागतः तत्र श्री**गङ्गदासभूवल्लभेन** लोकोत्तरग विद्योर्जितां कवितां विलोक्य सन्तुष्टेन बहुमानदानैः परितोष्य मच्चरित्राभिनयनाटकं भवता विधेयमित्युक्तः करोमीति स्वीकृत्य लोकोत्तरं नाटकमकार्षीत्. तदद्भुतमाकर्ण्य **गङ्गादासभूवल्लभो** बहुकनकरत्नैरापादतलमस्तकं तमापूरयत्। अस्य नाटकस्याभिनयं कर्तुं कश्चिन्नाटयकारस्समागच्छेदिति राजा चिन्तां करोतीत्युक्ते श्री**मल्लिकार्जुनराजेन** साधु कथितमस्मच्चिन्ता दूरीकृतेति बहुदानपुरस्सरं स वैतालिकः सन्मानितः (संमा)।

तदानीं तदास्थानस्थितेन रिपुनाट्यकारवारणमदनिवारणपञ्चाननेन मया तदाकर्ण्य तन्नाटकमहं नाट्यरसिकोऽभिनेष्यामीत्यत्र सोत्कण्ठमागतोऽस्मि। तावन्मम भाग्यगुणेन महाराजोऽपि महाकालमहामहोत्सवे कलाकुतूहलानि विलोकयन्नेव मन्नयनगोचरः समजनि। तदहं महाराजस्य युवराजत्वमारभ्य रूपकाभिनयाय नेपथ्याभिनयनाय गच्छामि। पश्यतु महाराजः। इति निष्क्रान्तः॥

* *Pāvāchala* is a hill close to Baroda on the banks of the water supply tank.

years A.D. 1449 or 1450. There is absolutely no mention of this or any war at all in Ferishta at this period.

Orissa Invasion.—The history of Orissa at the time throws some light upon the uncertainty. The ruling Ganga dynasty of Orissa had reached the stage of inanimation with the death of Narasing Rai Langora, as he was called in thirteenth century A.D. He was followed in succession by two lines called Ganga or Narasinga and Bānu. The last Bānu had been overthrown by the Muhammadans of Bengal who carried with them as prisoner the minister Kapilēśvara Bhowarbar. When the ruler died Kapilēśvara came to the throne, according to the researches of Stirling and Mon. Mohan Chakravarti in A. D. 1434–5. His reign which extended up to A. D. 1369–70 was one of constant war in the course of which he lays claim to having made various conquests among them Vijayanagar. In an inscription at a temple to Jagannātha in the Kaṭak District, he is referred to as '*Karṇāṭājahāsasimha* and *Kaḷavaragajayī*' the yawning lion to the sheep the Karṇāta king and the victor over Kaḷavaraga (Kulberga).* In the inscriptions of this ruler examined by Mr. M. M. Chakravarti these titles are not assumed by him up to his nineteenth *anka* which is computed to be the same as his sixteenth year,† that is up to the year A. D. 1450. In an inscription of his forty-first *anka* these are assumed and the inscription from which the above are taken belong to about the same time, his thirtieth year or about A. D. 1465. It seems possible then that the statement in the drama *Gangādāsapratāpavilāsam* is founded

* *J.A.S.*, Bengal, Vol. lxix, Part i, pp. 173–190.

† *Ibid.*, Vol. lxii, p. 90, *et seq.*

upon fact. That is not all. The drama makes a further statement that these two allies attacked Vijayanagar, after the death of Dēva Rāya II 'to wipe off the disgrace of former defeats'. If this means anything at all, it is that the Rāya of Orissa had figured in the earlier wars of Allau-d-din against Vijayanagar in A. D. 1437 to 1443.

Bahmani invasion.—Notwithstanding the silence of the Muhammadan historians in regard to this war, so much is clear that the death of Dēva Rāya brought on a Muḥammadan invasion, possibly in concert with another by the ruler of Orissa with whom the Bahmani kingdom came into touch by the absorption of Telingana on the one side and the conquest of a large part of Gondwana by Malwa on the other. This seems the more likely from what Abdur Razak states about the previous war as a result of the attempt on the life of Dēva Rāya II. We have also to take it that Mallikārjuna had the best of it from the silence of the Muhammadan historians on the one hand, and on the other from the actual political condition at the time of the Bahmani Kingdom, and its relations with the neighbouring chiefs Hindu and Mussalman on the other frontiers. An alliance or a mere understanding to engage the attention of Vijayanagar would account for the appearance of Kapilēś-vara of Orissa in the affair. It is this advance of Kapilēś-vara that will have to account for the move of the Śāḷuva chief Narasinga from the middle region to the Telingana frontier.

Both possible.—Mallikārjuna then began well by beating off the enemy who threatened the existence of Vijayanagar, and seems to have gone on well enough for a

few years. His rule must have lasted on to at least 1465 (Śaka 1387). In 1459 (Śaka 1381) we hear of Mallikārjuna 'ruling in happiness in Penugoṇḍa on business connected with administration (*rājakārya*) of Narasinga'. What is more than this he is said to have been there with his *Daṇṇāyaka* Timmaṇa. It is soon after this date that an invasion of the Coromandel region as far as Kanchi was successfully undertaken by Kapilēśvara, who has it in the inscription already referred to.

'Having made him (*Gōpinātha Mahāpatra*) the Commander-in-Chief, him who defeated the Maḷava king, who stood as a bar to the inroad of the Gauḍa king, the monarch Kapilēśvara enjoyed the Lakshmi (*Śrī*) of the *Karṇāṭa*, levied taxes (tributes better) over the *Khanḍa* hill, and carried *Kanchi* by force.' *

This invasion coupled with one upon Kanchi by the Pāṇḍyas in the year 1469† clearly indicates the causes which brought about the dismemberment of the Empire on the one side, and the gradual ascent of Narasinga to supreme power on the other. The foreign invasion from distant Orissa through provinces directly under the Government of Narasinga, and the attempt in the remoter provinces to throw off allegiance indicate a clear decline of power

---

* Jagannātha inscription of Kapilēśvara; verse 14: *J.A.S.*, Bengal, Vol. lxix, Part i, pp. 173-190 and Epigraphist's report for 1906-7, p. 65.

Kṛtva samyati mālavēndra-jayinam sēnādhināthamtuyam
Gauḍēndrasya nitāntam Utkala pathā-prasthānarōdh-ārgaḷam
Śrī Khanḍādri payōdharō parikaram nirmāya Kānchiharaḥ.
Sānandam Kapilēśvarō viharatē Karṇāṭa rāja Śriyā.

† Epigraphist's report for 1906–7, p. 56.

at headquarters. What was the part that Narasinga himself played in this? What could have brought about the feebleness in the ruling family?

Virūpāksha, Mallikārjuna's Brother and Successor.—'Virūpāksha should have succeeded to the throne in Śaka 1387' according to Mr. Krishna Sastri, who seems inclined to regard him as the son of Mallikārjuna. Virūpāksha's dates range between A. D. 1466 and 1485. What is more, Mr. Sastri rejects Professor Kielhorn's acceptances of Virūpāksha as the son of Dēva Rāya II by Simhaḷā Dēvi, and would regard him rather as the son of Dēva Rāya II's brother, Pratāpa Dēva 'who acquired the kingdom from his elder brothers.'* Both Mr. Sastri and the late Professor Kielhorn refer to the same passage † that Mr. Rice interpreted as referring to the Vijayanagar Princess married into the Bahmani family.

Mr. Sastri's interpretation would introduce an additional letter into the inscription for which, I am afraid, we have no warrant short of convincing proof that it is an error. Of such compelling need there is none such in this connection as Pratāpa Dēva did not rule at all and could not have obtained any *rājyam* from his elder brother other than those he governed at various places for his brother as did the various younger brothers before him. What is of

---

* Archæologist's Annual for 1907–8, p. 225, note 5.

† Tasya (Vijayabhūpatēḥ) Nārāyaṇī Dēvyām prādhurāsīt Yaśodhanaḥ
Prauḍha pratāpa Vibhavaḥ Pratāpākhyō mahīpatiḥ
Guṇairanēkhairavanītalēsmin Virājamānaḥ Sukṛtāpta kīrtir
Nijāgrajāprāptamanādirājyam Sādhīkṛtārthi Vraja pārijātaḥ

importance in this connexion is Mr. Sastri takes this part to refer not to Dēva Rāya II but to his brother Pratāpa Dēva. This interpretation seems quite improbable, and would be altogether impossible without the modification of the reading he implies—'*Nijāgrajāprāptam*' will have to be read '*Nijāgrajātprāptam*.' Even so the meaning would hardly suit the expressions in the rest of the passage. The Virūpāksha of this record must be regarded a brother of Mallikārjuna.

Virūpāksha, possibly a Usurper.—The passage immediately following in the same record seems to let us into the secret of the trouble which brought the State low indeed in vitality at a time when forces were gathering round to try her strength to the utmost extreme.

'Śiva was born of her, of excellent qualities, known by the name Virūpāksha, king of kings, the crown of rulers on earth, an incarnation of bountifulness, an unparalleled ocean of mercy. Having acquired the kingdom *by his own valour*, and being in the full enjoyment of all that is enjoyable, and having conquered all his enemies in war, he lives in happiness as the very hall of display for the goddess of valour.* The phrase, '*Nijapratāpād adhigatya-rājyam*' having conquered the kingdom by his own valour

---

* *Tasyām Śivahprādur abhūd guṇādhyō nāmnā Virūpāksha-iti prasiddhaḥ*
Rājādhirāja kshitipāla mauḷiḥ vadānya mūrtiḥ karuṇaika sindhuḥ
Nijapratāpād adhigatya rājyam samasta bhāgyaiḥ parisēvyamānaḥ
Sangrāmatas sarvaripūn vijitya sammōdatē vīrā vilāsa bhūmiḥ.

seems to indicate forcible acquisition of the kingdom either from his elder brother or it may be from his young nephews. Is there any warrant for such an assumption from the known circumstances of the time?

We have already noticed that the danger from the Bahmani kingdom had ceased to be imminent after the attempt which Mallikārjuna is said to have foiled by his own effort. The danger lay more on the side of Orissa. Telingana had ceased to be a buffer for almost a generation. The country between Rajamandri and Warangal happened now to be the scene of active, but almost of guerilla, warfare. The chieftains of forts were giving trouble to the Mussalman governors of the Bahmani Sultans, whose affairs at home were anything but peaceful. Kapilēśvara was an enterprising ruler and had come to the throne of Orissa with the support of the Muhammadan state of Bengal. About the time we have come to, he had reached the summit of his glory, and almost to the end of his reign. Malwa was making rapid advance on the side of Gondwana bringing Orissa on the one side and Ahmadnagar on the other as its immediate neighbour. In this posture of affairs, we need not be surprised if we see Śāḷuva Narasimha moving up from his province in the middle region towards the north where there was fighting to be done. This move on his part towards the most vulnerable frontier was an act of benefit both to his king and kingdom. What then is the significance of Mallikārjuna and his Daṇṇāik Timmaṇa's move to Penukoṇḍa on the business of Narasinga's kingdom? Was it jealousy of the rising power of the chief or was it the suspicion engendered by incapacity at headquarters? It may be either or both.

Whatever it was, it was about six years later that we come upon the change of rulers and Virūpāksha's accession possibly indicates the change at headquarters of a stranger ruler instead of a weaker one with the result that Narasinga perhaps leaves the headquarters severely alone. Kapilēśvara dies about the same time and is succeeded by Purushōttama whose rule covers the period 1469–70 to 1495–6. It is this ruler who led an army according to Ferishta in support of Rajamandri and Koṇḍapalli and marched as far as Kaulas. If Ferishta is to be taken at his word the Orissa monarch was beaten back into his dominions and a treaty imposed upon him the terms of which, as usual, do not go very much beyond the demand for twenty-five elephants. On his return he reduced various fortresses among them Koṇḍapalli, and is then said to have gone against the dominions of Narasinga, of whom Ferishta has the following referring to A. D. 1477. 'Narasing Ray was a powerful Raja possessing the country between the Carnatic and Telingana, extending along the sea coast to Muchlypatam and had added much of the Bijanagar territory to his own by conquest, together with several strong forts. He had frequently incited the zemindars on the Bhamani frontier to rebel; and the officers on the borders, unable to control his power, had more than once represented his conduct to court, which had, at length, induced the king to attack him'.* This passage gives us an insight into what Narasinga was about and why he gradually moved himself northwards.

Bahmani successes against Vijayanagar.— Before this, however, Muhammad Shah II had made two successful

---

* Brigg's Ferishta II, 398–9.

attempts against Vijayanagar on the western side. The first was the taking of Goa by Muhammad Gawan in 1469 and the next was the taking of Belgaum in 1472. The first was brought about according to Barros as a reprisal for a massacre of the Muhammadans of Bhāṭkal for having sold horses to the 'moors of the Dekkan'. The King of Vijayanagar ordered his vassal chiefs at Honawar to 'kill all those moors as far as possible and frighten the rest away.' The survivors fled and settled in Goa. This loss according to Nuniz, along with that of the ports of Chaull and Dabull occurred in the reign of Virūpāksha.*

These various operations between the years 1469 and 1481 give the impression that the Empire of Vijayanagar was in a bad way and one prominent man in it, at any rate. understood the need of united strength. That was Narasinga, Ferishta's description of the position of Narasinga and the mention in the Burhan-i-Máasir of Mālūr as a principal fort in his kingdom from which Kanchi was attacked, and the utter absence of any reference to the ruling power in all these transactions indicate a want of understanding between Narasinga and Virūpāksha which would warrant the inference that Virūpāksha perhaps came to the throne by means which did not commend themselves to the powerful Viceroys, and that he did not possess the qualities that a ruler at the time and in the circumstances of Vijayanagar should have had in ample measure. Narasinga was seconded in all his efforts by another powerful general Narasa Nāik, and the manner in which the former left all power in the latter's hands at his death in spite of

* Sewell: A Forgotten Empire, p. 99.

his having two sons go to prove clearly that his usurpation had no unworthy motive leading up to it. Virūpāksha probably had sons, one of whom was Prauḍa Dēva Rāya whom Mr. Krishna Sastri refers to as the Padeo Rao of Nuniz, Rājaśēkara and Virūpāksha II being the sons of Mallikārjuna. These would be supported by the party of loyalists as against that of the usurping uncle and his children. With these explanations in mind the account of Nuniz will become clear in regard to its general trend, if not in regard to all his details. The position then is this. Mallikārjuna died in 1465-6 or thereabouts and his half-brother succeeded setting aside two nephews, Rājaśēkara and Virūpāksha. These naturally created a powerful party against him, and he was perhaps not quite worthy of the exalted position. He managed to go on, however, letting a succession of misfortunes befall the empire to the disgust of the more powerful generals and governors. It may be he died or was murdered by his son even, Narasinga exerting himself all along to keep the empire intact despite the attacks of the Bahmani sultans on the one side, and the Gajapatis of Orissa on the other. The Gajapati Purushōttama, the successor son of Kapilēśvara, claims to have captured Kanchi and taken among the prisoners the King's daughter whom he married subsequently under romantic circumstances*. The following account of Nuniz will now become intelligible.

Nuniz Account.—'After his (Pina Rao's) death a son remained to him who inherited the kingdom and was called ...... and this king, as soon as he began to reign, sent to call

* Asiatic Researches, Vol. xv, pp. 280–82.

his treasurers and the minister and the scribes of his household, and inquired of them the revenue of his kingdom, and learned how much revenue came in yearly; and His Highness had every year thirteen millions of gold. This king granted to the pagodas a fith part of the revenue of his kingdom; no law is possible in the country where these pagodas are, save only the law of the Brahmans, which is that of priests; and so the people suffer.

On the death of this king succeeded a son named Verupacarao. As long as he reigned he was given over to vice, caring for nothing but women, and to fuddle himself with drink and amuse himself, and never showed himself either to his captains or to his people; so that in a short time he lost that which his forefathers had won and left to him. And the nobles of the kingdom, seeing the habits and life of this king, rebelled, every one of them, each holding to what he possessed, so that in his time the king lost Goa, and Chaull, and Dabull, and the other chief lands of the realm. This king in mere sottishness slew many of his captains. Because he dreamed one night that one of his captains entered his chamber, on the next day he had him called, telling him that he had dreamed that night that the captain entered his room to kill him; and for that alone he had him put to death. This king had two sons already grown up, who, seeing the wickedness of their father and how he had lost his kingdom, determined to kill him, as in fact was done by one of them, the elder, who was his heir; and after he had killed him, when they besought him to be king, he said, "Although this kingdom may be mine by right, I do not want it because I killed my father, and did

therein that which I ought not to have done, and have committed a mortal sin, and for that reason it is not well that such an unworthy son should inherit the kingdom. Take my brother and let him govern it since he did not stain his hands with his father's blood;" which was done and the younger brother was raised to the throne. And when they had entrusted the kingdom to him he was advised by his minister and captains that he should slay his brother, because as the latter had killed his father so he would kill him if desirous of so doing; and as it appeared to the king that such a thing might well be, he determined to kill him, and this was at once carried out, and he slew him with his own hand. So that this man truly met the end that those meet with who do such ill deeds. This king was called Padearao; and after this was done he gave himself to his women, and not seeking to know ought regarding his realm save only the vices in which he delighted, he remained for the most part in the city.

One of his captains who was called Narsymgua who was in some manner akin to him, seeing his mode of life, and knowing how ill it was for the kingdom that he should live and reign, though all was not yet lost, determined to attack him, and seize on his lands; which scheme he at once put into force.

He wrote therefore, and addressed the captains and chiefs of the kingdom, saying how bad it was for them not to have a king over them who could govern properly, and how it would be no wonder, seeing the manner of his life, if the king soon lost by his bad government even more than his father had done.'

The explanation of this account.—In this extract the following points require to be noted. It was Pina Rao's son that is nameless. If Pina Rao is taken to stand for Dēva Rāya II, then the peaceful monarch who led a life of peaceful administration and pious benefaction would be Mallikārjuna a not untrue characterization altogether. He was succeeded by his son according to Nuniz. There are inscriptions which indicate unmistakably that Mallikārjuna's son Rājaśēkara, succeeded, followed probably by Virūpāksha II, the younger brother for whom we have a date A.D. 1499. This is the legitimist succession. Rājaśēkara however, seems to have been ousted at Vijayanagar by Virūpāksha the uncle while some of the provinces at any rate recognized Rājaśēkara. Virūpāksha's unworthiness and cruelty which is quite understandable in his position brought on perhaps his death at the hands of his own son who made room, perhaps, for a younger brother who might well have been a Prauḍa Dēva Rāya as the grandson of Dēva Rāya II. Nuniz account would thus be reconciled with the information derivable from inscriptions if the possibility of error in regard to Virūpāksha being brother instead of son be admitted. There is absolutely no need to concede the accuracy of Nuniz in this particular and other facts need not be twisted to agree with his account.

Another theory.—There is, however, another theory of this same transaction, the usurpation of Śāḷuva Narasimha which requires to be considered. This is the theory put forward by Mr. Narasimhacharyar, the Mysore Archaeologist. The following is his theory in his own words.*

* Administration Report for 1908, p. 19.

'This chief belonged to the Śāluva family. He was the real ruler of the Vijayanagar kingdom for nearly forty years from about 1455 to 1493, in which latter year he appears to have died, this being the earliest known date of his son Śāḷuva Narasinga II. The last four rulers of the first dynasty which he supplanted were kings only in name, the real power being held in his own hands. Thus, so far back as 1459 we see him sending away Mallikārjuna to Penugoṇḍa (Mandya 12 and 59), and putting in 1462 his own minister Tirumalayaṇṇa-daḷapa on the throne of Mallikārjuna (Bowringpet 24). This Tirumalayaṇṇa may be his own elder brother Timma and identical with the Śāḷuva Tirumalaidēva-Mahārāja mentioned in No. 23 of Vol. II of *South Indian Inscriptions*. This Timmarāja, son of Guṇḍarāja, makes a grant in 1463 (*Madras Annual Report* for 1904, No. 249) for the merit of his younger brother Śāḷuva Narasinga I. Again, in 1468, during the nominal rule of Virūpāksha, we find a grant made for Narasinga's merit (Muḷbāgal 20); and in 1470 and 1472, during the same rule, we find Narasinga and his general Īśvara-Nāyaka, father of Narasa, making grants for the merit of each other (Muḷbāgal 253 and Bowringpet 104). In 1472 he is styled *mahāmaṇḍalēśvara* (*South Indian Inscriptions*, No. 116). This title appears to have continued till 1484 in which year he is mentioned as ruling (Māgaḍi 32). Muḷbāgal 104 mentions Narasinga's administration of the kingdom in 1485, naming at the same time Virūpāksha as the ruler. The usurpation of the throne most probably took place in 1486–7.'

Criticism of the theory.—The first point to call for remark in this theory is that Mr. Narasimhacharyar's

interpretation of the records of A.D. 1459 can hardly bear the interpretation he puts upon them when the records merely say that Mallikārjuna and Daṇṇāyaka Timmaṇa were 'ruling in happiness in Penugoṇḍa in connexion with the administrative business of Narasinga.'* The record 24 of Bowringpet which specifically states that Mallikārjuna was on the throne while Narasinga's officer Tirumalayaṇṇa was in charge of the province concerned. This misunderstanding seems to be due to the peculiar Tamil expressions which are ordinary elipses. These are '*Mallikārjuna Rāyar śingādanattil*' which can be rendered on the throne of Mallikārjuna though in this passage the construction requires the supply of a verb, as the locative 'on the throne' will otherwise be incomplete. There is no doubt that Śāḷuva Narasimha had an elder brother Timma who made a grant for the merit of his younger brother which, at the most can mean he held a province under him from the locality and other details connected with the grant. Nor can the exchange of courtesies indicated in the rest of the section be held to support the inference that Narasinga held any higher position than that of a powerful governor under Mallikārjuna. When Virūpāksha occupied the throne, however, the same binding obligation of allegiance was not felt for the monarch by the powerful chieftain, though the act of usurpation came later, only when there was no alternative left to save the empire from complete disruption and ultimate ruin. Such a statement of the general trend of affairs might have reached Nuniz correctly while there might have been errors in regard to details.

---

* Md. 12 and 59 of Śaka 1381 already referred to.

Conclusions derivable.—Ferishta's statement coupled with the information derivable from the inscriptions would warrant the assumption that Narasinga was consolidating his provinces under the rule of Mallikārjuna. The accession of Virūpāksha probably by violence alienated his sympathies, as those of others. When matters grew worse under his sons Narasinga usurped the throne as a step necessary for the preservation of the empire though during the whole of his life-time he seems to have had a nominal ruler. Nuniz statement in regard to a length of reign of forty-four years could be accounted for by taking it as the whole period of his influence and power as viceroy first, and then *de facto* ruler. This seems the trend of events indicated by the known facts and other assumptions seems hardly called for.

Influence of Orissa on Vijayanagar History.—We have indicated above the trend of events which led to the overthrow of the first dynasty of rulers at Vijayanagar by the Viceroy Śāḷuva Narasimha who ultimately took the empire into his own hands. The main influencing factor in this upward move of Narasimha was the power of Kapilēś-vara Dēva of Orissa, as we have shown. This particular influence has to be investigated carefully to understand the real character of Narasimha's usurpation. King Dēva Rāya II died in 1448–9, and Sultan Allau-d-din II Bahmani died in 1457 according to the Burhan-i-Mâasir. Kapilēśvara Bhowarbar became King of Orissa in 1435 and ruled till 1470.

Burhan-i-Máasir.—According to the Burhan-i-Máasir again Telingana was reduced to subjection about the end of the reign of Ahmed Shah Wali Bahmani. It was in 1435,

the year of accession of Kapilēśvara that Sanjar Khan, Governor of Telingana, comes into contact with the 'Ūriya leader of the infidels of Telingana.'* The ruler of Orissa is already referred to as possessed of a very large number of elephants as against 150 which was all that the Bahmani Sultans had.

In the year 1457–8, Humayun the cruel laid siege to Dēvarakoṇḍa 'in the course of a *jihád*'. 'After the lapse of some days, the defenders of the fortress being reduced to extremities, sent a message to the Rāy of Uriya (Orissa) who at the time was *chief of the infidels of that country*'. He agreed to assist 'from greed of gain' and 'for the defence of paganism'.

Then came the invasion of the Bahmani kingdom by the Rāy of Orissa, soon after the accession of the Sultan Nizam Shah in 1461.

In the year 1470, the queen-mother of the Bahmani Sultan, Makdumah Jahan died. 'In the midst of these affairs a messenger arrived from Telingana and informed the Sultan that the Rāya of Orissa, who was the principal Rāy of Telingana was dead'. There was a Bahmani invasion of Telingana in consequence in the course of which Rajamandri and Koṇḍavīḍ were besieged and taken before the year 1471.

In the year 1474 Wairagarh was invaded and taken from Jatak Rāy. An army was sent against the southern Mahratta country.† In this same year 1474 and in the

* *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. xxviii, pp. 215-6.

† *Indian Antiquary* Vol. xxviii, p. 257.

midst of these occurrences Khwajah Jahan Khwajah Mahammad Gawan informed the Sultan that the perfidous Perkatapah had withdrawn his head from the collar of obedience. and raising the standard of revolt had taken possession of the island of Goa. He added : 'With Your Majesty's permission I will go and put down this rebellion and chastise that accursed one, conquer the whole country of *Kanara* and *Vijayanagar* and annex them to the dominions of Islam'. Belgaum fell in the course of this war. A famine broke out this year and lasted for two years, owing to a succession of failure of the monsoon.

'In the midst of these affairs' that is about 1475–6–the Rāy of Orissa invaded Telingana and beat back Nizam-ul-Mulk Bahri for safety to Wazirabad. The Sultan arrived with reinforcements and marched upon Rajamandri.

'When they arrived in the neighbourhood of the fortress of Rajamandri, they saw an immense city, on the farther side of which the infidel Narasimha Rāya with 70,000 cursed infantry and 500 elephants like mountains of iron had taken his stand. On this side of the river he dug a deep ditch, on the edge of which he had built a wall like the rampart of Alexander, and filled it with cannon and guns and all the apparatus of war. Yet notwithstanding all this army and pomp and pride and preparation, when Narasimha Rāya heard of the arrival of the Sultan's army, thinking it advisable to avoid meeting their attack, he elected to take to flight'. Rajamandri fell in consequence and its governor was enrolled among the Turki, Telangi and Habshi slaves !

In the year 1480 the Sultan laid siege to Koṇḍavīḍ to put down a rebellion 'of his subjects who, throwing themselves upon the protection of Narasiṁha Rāya had altogether withdrawn from the allegiance to the rule of Islam'. Koṇḍavīḍ fell in time.

'After the conclusion of the affair at Koṇḍavīḍ agreeably to his desires, it occurred to the Sultan that the extensive plains are open only to military operations up to the rainy season, and the eradication of the worshippers of Lāt and Manāt, and the destruction of the infidels was an object much to be desired; and as the infidel Narasiṁha—who, owing to his numerous army and the extent of his dominions, was the greatest and most powerful of all the rulers of Telingana and Vijayanagar had latterly shown delay and remissness in proving his sincerity towards the royal court by sending presents and *nalbahā*; therefore the best course to adopt was to trample his country under the hoofs of his horses, and level the buildings with the ground.

It has been related that this Narasiṁha had established himself in the midst of the countries of Kanarah and Telingana and taken possession of most of the districts of the coast and interior of Vijayanagar'.

The Sultan then marched to Koṇḍavīḍ and advancing about forty farsakhs (about 136 miles, actual distance 270 miles) arrived within sight of the fortress of Mālūr, the greatest fort of the country. Narasiṁha in sheer terror made the usual presents and submitted without the least show of fight. Information then reaching him of the

richness of the temple and city of Ganji (Kanchi) at a distance of fifty farsakhs (about 170 miles, actual distance in a straight line is 120 miles). Coming up at the head of a select force he laid siege to the city on a date corresponding to March 12 1481; and sacked it. He ordered an 'elegant poetical account of this celebrated victory to be written, and copies distributed throughout his dominions'.

Murder of Muhammad Gawan.—This was followed by the conspiracy against, and the murder in cold blood of Muhammad Gawan and all the evil consequences that flowed therefrom. It is clear from this narrative of the Mussalman historian, that thanks to the exertions of the Queen-mother Makdumah Jahan there was peace between the Bahmani kingdom and Malwa through the intervention of the Gujarat Sultan. Vijayanagar was simultaneously exposed to attacks in the front and in both flanks by the Bahmani Sultans and the Rājas of Orissa. Narasimha's activities were all in the east and there is absolutely no mention of his name in connexion with the operations in the west—either round Goa or in the southern Mahratta country—up to the year 1482. More than this Narasimha was able to maintain his position all along while in all the campaigns in the west the advantage lay clearly with the enemies of Vijayanagar perhaps because of inefficiency and mismanagement at headquarters as is but too evident in the affairs of Belgaum.

During the period 1450 to 1482 Vijayanagar was subjected to recurring attacks of powerful enemies from without, disputed successions and division of authority within, showing the empire, on the verge of dismemberment.

It was in this state of affairs that Narasimha's usurpation took place.

The Śāḷuvas.—Mr. Krishna Sastri writes, 'Neither the Telugu poems, nor epigraphical records tell us who the Śāḷuvas were from whom Narasinga and his ancestors traced their descent, what relation if any, existed between them and the Kings of the First Dynasty of Sangama, and what again was the connexion between the usurper Narasinga and his generals Īśvara and Narasimha (Narasimha Nāyaka), who, though calling themselves members of a branch of the Yadava dynasty which ruled over Tuḷuva country (Tuḷuvēndra) often identified themselves with the Śāḷuvas by adopting the very same family titles'.

Śāḷuvābhyudayam.—The Sanskrit Kāvya *Śāḷuvābhyudayam*, composed specifically to celebrate the deeds of Narasimha by a contemporary poet who calls himself Rājanātha Diṇḍima, throws some light upon this obscurity. According to this work the name Śāḷuva was acquired as a result of the bravery exhibited by one of the rulers of this family, Śāḷuva Mangi, a hawk among men, to distinguish him from a brother of the same name. This work gives the usual genealogy of a pauranic character tracing the descent of the family from the moon to Puru who exchanged his youth for the old age of his father. Then it refers to some rulers of whom so far nothing more is known, to one of whom, or to whose father, are given the titles, *Chālukyanārāyaṇa Mōhana Murāri, Mēdinīmīsaragaṇḍa* because of their having been beloved rulers of the earth. Their names are *Śāṇūramalla, Śighāṇamalla* and *Kavāri Rāya.* A stanza (*śloka*) following explains the peculiar title

Panchaghaṇṭānināda, much affected by the family as having been acquired by the exhibition, in unparalleled measure, of the five qualities of truthfulness, bountifulness, courage, learning and valour.* In this family was born Guṇḍa 'who killed in battle the Sultan who had got ready for the conquest of the world'. He had his residence in *Kalyāṇapura* and had for his queen Kamalādēvi. This is the first historical man in the family, and his position at Kalyāṇi and the achievement against the Sultan noted above raised him to prominence. The Sultan referred to was probably Sultan Alau-d-din I of the Bahmani kingdom whose early wars were among the fortified cities of the Telingana frontier among which figures prominently Kalyāṇi, the ancient capital of the Chāḷukyas. The connexion with the Yadava is no more than the usual association of the name with the southern branches of 'the line of the moon.'

Then come his six sons who are known from other sources among whom the most distinguished was the one known Śāḷuva Mangi. He went, with the permission of his brothers, southwards to make new conquests, although the south had already been conquered. He succeeded in killing the Sultan of the south. Finding that the Chōḷa, Pāṇḍya and Kēraḷa rulers had gone away in fear, he overcame Sambuvarāya and established him in his kingdom thus earning for him and his descendants the title *Chamburāya Sthāpanāchāryaḥ*'. He conquered some important city in Gujarat and earned the title *Gurjarīyaṭṭavibhāḍa*. Having overcome every one he attacked as a falcon does the

* cf. *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. vii, p. 81, ll. 28–32.

other birds, he and his descendants adopted the title *Sāḷuvēndra*. Having conquered all his enemies from Lanka to Mēru (Himalayas) he went to Śrīrangam and reestablished God Ranganātha as before in the holy place and made large benefactions.*

This work while making the statement that he made to the God a donation of one thousand *sāḷagramas*, does not mention the gift of 60,000 *māḍas* (half-pagodas of gold) that the Jamini Bhāratmu mentions.

Among his sons, mention is made in this work of only one, Gauta to whom was born, like Abhimanyu to Arjuna, Guṇḍa.

This is Guṇḍa III of the genealogical table appended. To this Guṇḍa and his wife Mallāmbika was born as a result of the devotion of the pair to God Nṛsimha at Ahōbalam, Nṛsimha who became known afterwards Śāḷuva Narasimha. Gauta having retired into the forests to spend the evening of his life in contemplation upon the divine, Narasimha ascended the throne of his fathers, meaning no more than that he succeeded his father as Governor at Chandragiri. He is persuaded to give up sorrowing for his parent's retirement from life, but to carry on with the accustomed vigour of his ancestors the work of administration during youth and manhood to retire when old age came on. Accepting this counsel of wisdom he sets out on a conquering expedition to get the world rid of his natural enemies, the

---

* *Ālankamāmēru ripūn aśēṣān*
Āśōṣayat Śāḷuva Mangi dēvaḥ
Sadangavāṇīmayatungaśṛnga
Śrī Rangamōnkāramayāgatōbhūt.

avatār of the *asuras*, as he himself was an avatār of Vishṇu.

He is urged on to take up this work at once as his enemies were likely to be careless considering his youth and the consequent want of hold upon the loyalty of his generals and the army. He is here shown to us in Chandragiri in contrast to Vishṇu in Tirupati.*

His first expedition was against the ruler of Orissa whose territory he invaded. There is, of course, the usual Homeric battle, the advantage ultimately resting with Narasimha. The Orissa king is compelled to retire within the walls of his city which is laid siege, to, in consequence.†

A breach was made and the fortress surrendered. After dictating terms of peace Narasimha returned obviously to Chandragiri.

He then started on a progress through his dominions. Leaving Chandragiri by way of Kāḷahasti, Narasimha moved towards the south. Sighting Tiruvaṇṇāmalai from a distance, he passed into the Chōḷa country whose king had run away anticipating Narasimha, by the sound of his war-drum. Narasimha passed along by way of Tiruvaḍamarudūr

---

* Sāḷuvābhyudayam, Canto III, pp. 41-2.
Tadiha sakalarakṣha sāvadānō
Viharati sārngadarōhi Vēnkaṭādrau
Savidha bhuvi tadā hitāvamāyām
Nṛipavaras Chandragirau ni . . . ,

† *Hatvāsiṣṭaischa gajairagātpuram*
Kalingrājō Yudhikaṇḍithādharaḥ
Sa śaila durgam tapanādhvarōh (*dha*) *krit*
Viśāla sālam bahuyantra sādanam.

to Kumbakōṇam. He took the road on the northern bank of the Kaveri and went to Śrīrangam and Jambukēśvaram. Then he marched on to Madura wherefrom he proceeded to Rāmēśvaram whence he returned to his capital again. Throughout this royal progress every ruler submitted and paid tribute, even the Ceylon King sending a respectful embassy. While he was back again at his capital at Chandragiri, Narasimha invaded Nāgamaṇḍala on the advice of Kuṭavāchalēndrataṭavāsi [he or (they), who reside at the foot of the Western Ghats ?]. He left a garrison there and returned at leisure with the desire to conquer Prithugiri (Big mountain, probably the Himalayas). It was then that he was attacked by the Muhammadan army. He won a complete victory against them and showed to the world that he was indeed the *Dharaṇīvarāha* (the primeval boar, that reclaimed the earth from below the waters). Passing through *Daśārṇa*, he reached the Himalayas. He leaves his boar emblem (lānchana) on the face of the Himalayas, and returns by way of Kāśi (Benares) where he was anointed emperor.

Historical material gleaned from the Kāvya (Epic). The rest of the work being occupied with the ordinary epic embellishments need not detain us longer. Apart from the epic treatment, the historical facts that stand out are these— that Narasimha had his headquarters at Chandragiri with the Government of the province around it ; in all likelihood Chandragirirājya was his ancestral government ; that his first great war was against the Kalinga King; that he could make a peaceful claim to authority over all the south up to Rāmēśvaram, and come in touch even with Ceylon (this has already been accomplished under Dēva Rāya II) and

that his last war was against the Muhammadans. Unless *Kuṭavāchala* should be interpreted Western Ghats and *Nāgamaṇḍala*, Nagarakhaṇḍa or Kanara, there is no mention of any western portion of Vijayanagar, nor is there the least indication of his having had anything to do with Vijayanagar. Narasimha was solely the successor of Kumāra Kampaṇa of Muḷuvāyi Mahārājya, or of Lakkaṇṇa, 'Lord of the Southern Ocean' under Dēva Rāyā II.

Narasimha's move northwards.—It then appears clear that Narasimha from his ancestral capital at Chandragiri ruled over the southern provinces of Vijayanagar and kept them well in hand. When Kapilēśvara Gajapati moved southwards upon the coast part of Telingana immediately after the death of Dēva Rāya II, Narasimha had to move north to keep this rising power in check. Kapilēśvara's invasion of Vijayanagar was perhaps a diversion to draw Narasimha out of the way. Having beaten back Kapilēśvara he returned to the south made a progress through his dominions to see that all was right and went up to the Telingana frontier at the time when Kapilēśvara's vaunted invasion of Kanchi was undertaken some time after 1457, the year of death of Sultan Alau-d-din II. It is this invasion which is referred to in the records at Jambai near Tiruvaṇṇāmalai and in Tirukkōilūr as the *Oḍḍiyan-kalāpa* about ten years previous to the date of the records.* This was the occasion that called for the presence of Mallikārjuna and his minister Timma at Penugoṇḍa 'on business connected with Narasinga's kingdom',† a necessary precaution

*Madras Epigraphist's Report, 1907, Section 56, p. 84.

† Md. 12 and 59 already referred to.

as a later Bahmani diversion along this line makes it apparent. His activity on this frontier proved so far successful that he was able not only to keep back the enemy of Kalinga who had taken possession of Telingana coast up to the Krishna, but even gain some advantages against the Muhammadans of Telingana.

The death of Kapilēśvara in 1470 gave a few years respite on this frontier, and when again the Bahmani Sultans began to be active elsewhere, that is, in the south and south-west of their territory Purushōttama Gajapati had settled matters to his satisfaction at home and was in readiness not only to imitate his father's example but improve upon it. Narasimha had to be alert on his side. In 1475–6 we find him strongly posted in Rajamandri as against the Bahmani Sultan, when he invaded Rajamandri in consequence of an invasion of the Telingana coast by the king of Orissa. In spite of the much vaunted boast of the Burhan-i-Máasir, Narasimha was able to hold his own both against the Gajapati and the Bahmani kings, while matters go very much against Vijayanagar, probably because, as was indicated, Virūpāksha had succeeded and began to mismanage at Vijayanagar to the disgust of the greater viceroys and governors, such as Narasimha himself. Narasimha's hold upon the Telingana frontier was still very firm. Koṇḍaviḍ revolted against the Muhammadans in 1480. Sultan Muhammad Shah II (1463 to 1482) went to Koṇḍavīḍ and having suppressed the rebellion there, broke through the middle of the Vijayanagar frontier to the fort of Mālūr and then he conducted in person a raid upon Kanchi. The successful occupation of Mālūr and raid upon Kanchi indicate clearly the incapacity that had taken hold of the

headquarters administration at Vijayanagar on the one hand, and the success with which Narasimha held his ground in the east on the other. Five or six years from this date the usurpation of Narasimha takes place as related by Nuniz.

Nuniz Story.—One of his captains who was called Narsymgua, who was in some manner akin to him, seeing his mode of life, and knowing how ill it was for the kingdom that he should live, and reign, though all was not yet lost, determined to attack him and seize on his lands; which scheme he at once put into force.

He wrote, therefore, and addressed the captains and chiefs of the kingdom, saying how bad it was for them not to have a king over them who could govern properly, and how it would be no wonder, seeing the manner of his life, if the king soon lost by his bad Government even more than his father has done.

He made great presents to all of them so as to gain their goodwill, and when he had thus attached many people to himself he made ready to attack Bisnaga where the king dwelt. When the king was told of the uprising of this captain Narsymgua, how he was approaching and seizing his lands and how many people were joining him, he seemed unmindful of the loss he had suffered, gave no heed to it nor made ready; but, instead, he only ill-treated him who had brought the news. So that a captain of the army of this Narsymgua arrived at the gates of Bisnaga, and there was not a single man defending the place; and when the king was told of his arrival he only said that it could not be. Then the captain entered the city, and the

king only said that it could not be. Then he even entered his palace and came as far as the doors of his chamber, slaying some of the women. At last the king believed, and seeing now how great was the danger, he resolved to flee by the gates on the other side; and so he left his city and palaces and fled.

When it was known by the captain that the king had fled he did not trouble to go after him, but took possession of the city and of the treasures which he found there; and he sent to acquaint his lord, Narsymgua. And after that Narsymgua was raised to be king. And as he had much power and was beloved by the people, thenceforward this kingdom of Bisnaga was called the kingdom of Narsymgua.'

The origin and position of the Śāḷuvas.—It ought to be clear by now who the Śāḷuvas were from the account given of them in the *Śāḷuvābhyudayam*. They were a family of chieftains dispossessed of their ancestral territory by the rising power of the Bahmanis. They threw in their lot under Gunḍa I and his son Śāḷuva Mangi with the five brothers who founded the Empire of Vijayanagar and co-operated heartily with them and their sons in expelling the Muhammadans from the south. They seem to have had their headquarters at Chandragiri and appear to have been Vaishṇavas. The family must have been of sufficient distinction to become allied with the royal family in the person of Śāḷuva Tippa, an uncle of the usurper Narasimha. This Tippa had married the elder sister of Dēva Rāya II, and his son Gōpa was Governor of Tekal while his father's Government was a little further south. This Gōpa's sons

Tirumalairāya and Tippa were other distinguished members of the family. It is noteworthy that all these are found in the middle region where Śāḷuva Mangi must have carved out a principality for himself.

Rai Sahib Krishna Sastri has with commendable industry gathered all the Śāḷuva names together on page 167 of the A.S.R. for 1908–9. It is clear from this list and other known instances that all those who assumed Śāḷuva *birudas* were not necessarily related, as various subordinate princes assumed not only well known *birudas* of a general character but even specific names of their sovereigns. Loyal governors and puissant generals of these Śāḷuvas seem to have assumed Śāḷuva *birudas* as the particular instance of Sambuvarāya shows.*

---

* There is mention of a minister and general of Harihara II whose name is Guṇḍa. He is credited with having conquered all the kingdoms, the conventional fifty-six, and the following specific achievements are also ascribed to him. 'Having conquered the Keraḷas, Tauḷavas, Andhras and Kūṭakas he seized their wealth and gave it to his king. Dragging the elephant-like Saipa, Patheya and other proud Turushkas along by their hair in battle, he confined them in his stables like monkeys; and besides them seized by the throat the two great tigers known as Jyēshṭa and Kanishṭa'. He is further said to have planted pillars of victory in all the countries and by order also of Harihara Mahārāya restored the grants which Vishṇuvardhana Biṭṭi Dēva Rāya, ruler of the Hoyśaṇa country, had made for the God Channakēśavanātha, his family god, and which had by lapse of time been greatly reduced . . . and re-built with seven storeys the gōpura over the doorway, which Ganga Salar, the Turuka of Kulburga, had come and burnt. It is likely that this Guṇḍa was either the first or the second of the name in the Śāḷuva family, rather the first than the second as he is credited with no achievement of any kind in any of the various records available; but it is impossible to be certain about it in the absence of any definite indication of the connexion in the record in question. There is a striking similarity between this inscription and the Śāḷuvābhyudayam in regard to the actual deeds of valour.

Inscriptions confirm these conclusions.—If now we turn our attention to the inscriptions we find, from their distribution and contents, they confirm the conclusions that have been drawn from the other available sources. Śāḷuva Narasimha comes prominently to notice pretty early in the reign of Mallikārjuna, though it would be hazardous to assert that he played any part in repelling the Kalinga-Bahmani invasion of Vijayanagar. He seems to have been helped almost from the beginning of his career by Timma, the Tuḷuva chieftain, but very much more by his son Īśvara and his son Narasa who ultimately became his trusted chief of the staff, Civil and Military. The achievements ascribed to Īśvara in the *Varāhapurāṇam* and the *Pārijāthāpaharaṇam* are deeds of valour that he did for his master, and indicate where exactly Śāḷuva Narasimha had to do the most fighting. Contemporary inscriptions only echo what these Telugu works have to say. In the words of Mr. Jayanti Ramayya Pantulu, 'According to the *Varāhapurāṇam* Narasimharāya's first general Īśvara of the Tuḷuva family conquered the forts (1) Udyādri (Udayagiri in Nellore), (2) Huttāri (probably Puttūr in Kārvēṭinagar), (3) Gaṇḍigoṭa, (4) Penugoṇḍa, (5) Beggalur (the reading of the manuscript is Bengulūru, i.e. Bangalore), (6) Kovela Nallūru, (7) Kuṇḍāṇi (in the Salem District, formerly capital of the Hoysala Vīra Rāmanātha), (8) Goḍuguchinta, (9) Bāgūru, (10) Naragoṇḍa (probably Naragallu in Chittur Taluq), (11) Āmūru (Giḍ Āmūru or Āmūrdurga) (in Guḍiyāttam Taluq) and (12) Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇa, and "destroyed the cavalry of the Yavanas of *Beḍendakōṭa* at Gaṇḍikōta." The Yavanas referred to here are the Bahmani kings who transferred their capital from

Kulburga to Bider in June A.D. 1423, during the reign of Ahmed Shah. Referring to the same event, the author of the Telugu poem *Pārijātāpaharaṇam* says that *Īśvara* "gave rise to thousands of rivers of blood by killing the horses of the Yavanas of *Baḍandakōṭa* ", but he transfers the same to *Kanducūru*. The Muhammadan historians do not of course refer to this event.'

The edition of the *Varāhapurāṇam* brought out by Rao Bahadur Viresalingam Pantulu gives the reading Kandukūru and the manuscript copies * in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library confirm this reading. Kandukūru perhaps is the more likely place in this connexion. The places mentioned are distributed all over what became later the Karnatic Payeen Ghat, the southern portion of Mysore and the coast districts of Nellore, and perhaps even Krishna, in all of which fighting had to be done to beat off the Muhammadans. This could have been only in the sixties and seventies of the fifteenth century, consequent upon the invasion of Kapilēśvara about A.D. 1461–2. It is this series of wars that takes Narasimha gradually northwards to the frontiers of the Bahmani kingdom and Telingana where we find him according to Ferishta in A.D. 1477. Kapilēśvara's death before A.D. 1470 on the one side, and the change of rulers on the throne of Vijayanagar, left him no alternative in the one case, and gave him the opportunity for making himself independent in the other. Up to A.D. 1467 grants in which his name occupies prominent place are found only

* No. 304 of the revised Triennial Catalogue of manuscripts in the Government Oriental Library.

in North Arcot and Kolar districts. In the seventies they extend from Tirukōilūr to Nāgamangala. A grant dated A.D. 1481 at Khankanhalli refers to our Channapaṭṇa province'. By about this time Śāḷuva Narasimha had become by far the most powerful and effective ruler of all the provinces of Vijayanagar below the Ghats, and the plain country of Mysore. The Malnāḍ districts of Mysore and the West Coast comprising the Malē Rājya and the Tuḷu Rājya, with the country round Vijayanagar were the only provinces which were not under effective control of the headquarters, the southern Mahratta country fast slipping out of the hands of the rulers of Vijayanagar since the fall of Goa and Belgaum. In other words it was only the territories under the control of Narasimha that were able to hold their own as against the enemies of Vijayanagar, the other portions fast passing into the hands of the Muhammadans, or on the highroad to disintegration.

Further the earlier inscriptions relating to this period acknowledge the suzerainty of Mallikārjuna. This formality begins to drop out in the sixties, and Virūpāksha's name appears but sparingly. Inscriptions after A.D. 1471 give him the full birudas. The combined result of these converging lines of evidence is that Śāḷuva Narasimha began as the Governor of Chandragiri his ancestral estate. The neighbouring governments having been in the hands of members of his own family he peacefully developed his resources to become a pillar of the empire when the empire was hard pressed by enemies on its most vulnerable frontier. This gave him the chance of advancing northwards up to the very frontiers of the Bahmani kingdom. When he saw the Imperial family losing its hold upon the provinces, he

was able to hold the provinces well together after the distintegrating eruption of Kapilēśvara Gajapati, the effect of which had been felt even as far south as Tirukōilūr in the South Arcot District. When a change of ruler did take place and the throne happened to be occupied by an unworthy man like Virūpāksha whose folly cost the Empire Goa, and its possessions in the north-west, Narasimha could see clearly that the empire built up at such great cost of blood and brains was going to ruin. He let matters drift as he was not quite sure of the temper of the various viceroys and governors of first rank. He does not appear to have cherished ambitions of a personal kind, as it would have been easy for him to have overthrown the empire any time after A.D. 1470. As Nuniz has it, he gave the best chance for the royal family on the throne to rehabilitate itself, and when he found there was no chance in that direction he had no alternative left but to take upon himself the responsibility of administering the empire. For at the time, the empire wanted a man of ability and initiative to keep it intact both from the disruptive tendencies within and the disintegrating shocks from the enemy without. It is under a supreme imperial necessity such as this that he appears, from all the evidence available to us, to have usurped the empire.

The Date of the First Usurpation.—The last record of Virūpāksha available to us is one dated Friday, July 29, 1485.* The first in which Śāḷuva Narasimha appears with the Imperial titles, *Rājādhirājā, Rāja Paramēśvara*, etc.,†

* Mulbagal, 104.

† Tumkur, 54.

is dated November 1, 1486. Between these dates, the actual usurpation must have taken place, there having been two sons of Mallikārjuna alive at the time not counting the prince who was set aside, a son of Virūpāksha, Mallikārjuna's brother. The palace revolution described in Nuinz probably took place just a tittle before, and perhaps hastened the change of dynasty.

The Order of Succession.—This brings us to the next problem of the period, namely, the order and dates of the changes of rulers on the throne during the period A.D. 1485 to 1509. When Sewell wrote his work on Vijayanagar fifteen years ago it was not known that there was a double usurpation, and that there were actually four rulers in succession who wielded the supreme power during this short period. The credit of the discovery of the second usurper actually belongs to the Mysore Archæologist Mr. R. Narasimhacharyar, and it is now generally taken that there ruled in succession Śāḷuva Narasimha, the first usurper, his son the second Narasimha, then the second usurper Narasa and then his son Vīra Narasimha who was succeeded by his half-brother Krishna Dēva Rāya. The matter is already obscure for lack of records bearing clearly upon a matter like this and the absence of mention of these except very casually and carelessly in Muhammadan histories by the similarity of name, all of them are called Narasimha, and the still greater similarity of titles and *birudas* they assumed. Notwithstanding all these drawbacks there are some distinguishing marks to guide us through the tangle of names and titles in the contemporary grants which are about ninety of them, tabulated in an appendix. The first two belonged to the family of the Śāḷuvas who began as

Governors of Chandragiri and advanced in power gradually to become Emperors. The characteristic *Śāḷuva* titles and *birudas*, either all of them or some at least, always precede their names. These titles were unfortunately assumed, by way of compliment to the Śāḷuvas by their loyal subordinates, or were conferred upon them as a matter of honour by the ruling Śāḷuva for the time being. The first usurper is known in these records as Śāḷuva Narasimha with one or more of the Śāḷuva titles which are many; *Mēdinīmīsaragaṇḍa Kaṭṭāri Śāḷuva* etc. The second of the four usually is Immaḍi Narasimha with these titles, and is often described as the son of Śāḷuva Narasimha. The records of Śāḷuva Narasimha as Emperor are not many nor widespread, but those of his son are found all over the empire in large numbers. He is also sometimes called *Tanmarāya* (the Tama Rao of Nuniz) written in Tamil, Tanmarāya the equivalent of Dharmarāya and occasionally we find the Sanskrit form as well.

The one who succeeded him on the throne is taken to be Narasa or Narasa Nāyaka of the Tuḷuva family and son of Īśvara Nāyaka. He is not ordinarily mentioned as Narasimha though in this style he is occasionally described. His son was known Narasimha with a combination of all the titles of his predecessors, the Śāḷuvas and Karṇāṭas, but also even some, of the Hoysalas. The fashion was probably set by his predecessor on the throne Śāḷuva Narasimha II. While the above is the usual order of the succession no agreement has been arrived at in regard to the date of accession of each. Mr. Sewell attempts a final settlement of this matter by a contribution he made in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for July 1915, and sums up his thesis

in the following words:—'Differing from some writer on the subject, I place the first usurpation by Narasimha as on some day between August 29, 1485, and November 1, A.D. 1486; his death and the accession of Immaḍi Narasimha as on some day prior to January 27, A.D. 1493; the second usurpation by Narasa Nāyaka, his death, and the accession of his son Vīra Narasimha as during the interval between February 28 and July 16 (or August 14) of A.D. 1505. Vīra Narasimha's death and the accession of Krishna Dēva Rāya are known to have taken place on some day earlier than October 14 or November 13, A.D. 1509.'

Narasa Nāyaka.—In investigating the problem of chronology suggested in this extract from Mr. Sewell's articles, it is necessary to consider the position of another chief who played a very important part in the changes that passed the empire on to Krishna Dēva Rāya ultimately. This was Narasa, generally regarded as the second usurper. We first find mention of his name in a record of A.D. 1482-3 when in all probability he came to occupy the position of foremost of Śāḷuva Narasinga's servants although that honour continues to be given to one Nāgama Nāyaka in A.D. 1484. His grandfather Timma is referred to only in general terms, while his father Īśvara bore a valiant part in all the fighting that his master has had to do in the course of his ascent to power, as is but too clear in the extracts quoted above from the introduction to the Dēvulupalle plates of Immaḍi Narasimha edited by Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu, and in the Telugu poems *Varāhapurāṇam* and the later *Pārijāthāpaharaṇam.* It is thus clear that the Tuḷuva Chief Īśvara rendered yeomen service to Śāḷuva Narasimha before he became

Emperor. It was the turn of his son Narasa already distinguished in war at the camp of his father and the father's master, to become the pillar of the empire under Śāḷuva Narasimha the Emperor. What follows from Nuniz will explain the relative positions of Narasimha and Narasa clearly.

'When it was known to the Captain that the king had fled he did not trouble to go after him, but took possession of the city and of the treasures which he found there; and he sent to acquaint his lord Narasyingua. And after that Narasyingua was raised to be king. And as he had much power and was beloved by the people, thenceforward his kingdom of Bisnaga, was called the kingdom of Narasyingua.

After he was raised to be king and was obeyed he came to Bisnaga, where he did many acts of justice; and he took the territories from whomsoever had, contrary to right, taken them from the king. This king reigned forty-four years, and at his death left all the kingdom in peace, and he gained all the lands which the kings his predecessors had lost. He caused horses to be brought from Oromuz and Adeem into his kingdom and thereby gave great profit to the merchants paying them for the horses just as they asked. He took them dead or alive at three for a thousand pardaos, and of those that died at sea they brought him the tail only, and he paid for it just as if it had been alive.

At the death of the king there remained three fortresses which had revolted from his rule, and which he was never able to take, which were these—Rachol and Odegary

and Conadolgi which have large and rich territories and are the principal forts in the kingdom.'

The Character of Narasimha's Usurpation.—This extract makes it clear that Narasimha's purpose in usurping the throne was not personal aggrandizement but the perpetuation of the empire built at such great pains by his predecessors in the second and remoter generations. Further than this it shows unmistakably that he was able to rehabilitate the empire already considerably dismembered except for the three fortresses of vital strength for the maintenance of that empire. When death came to him he had not quite fully discharged the duties that he took upon himself by the assumption of imperial power, but made the next best arrangement, which again shows he had a more patriotic programme than the selfish greed of the ordinary usurper. In the words of Nuniz again 'At his death he left two sons, and the Governor of the kingdom was Narasenaque who was father of the king that afterwards king of Bisnaga; and this king (Narasymgua), before he died, sent to call Narasenaque his minister, and held converse with him, telling him that at his death he would by testament leave him to govern the kingdom until the princes should be of an age to rule; also he said that all the royal treasures were his alone and he reminded him that he won this kingdom of Narasymgua at the point of the sword; adding that now there remained only three fortresses to be taken, but that for him the time for their capture was passed; and the king begged him to keep guard over the kingdom and to deliver it up to the Princes, to whichever of them should prove himself the most fitted for it. And after the King's death this Narasenaque remained as Governor, and soon raised up

the Prince to be King, retaining in his own hands the treasures and revenues and the government of the country.' This testament of Śāḷuva Narasinga reveals the true inwardness of the usurpation that took place in A. D. 1485–6. Narasinga's function, as he understood it, was to recover the lost portions of the empire of Vijayanagar and restore it to its past greatness and unity. He fell short of achieving this ambition as he was not able to capture during his own life-time the three fortresses of Udayagiri, Koṇḍavīḍ and Raichore. He quite realized that the empire required a strong ruler and nominated his chief General Narasa as his actual successor and *de facto* ruler, and left the choice of an Emperor from out of his two sons to him.

Narasa, successor of Narasimha in all but name.—It is thus clear that the real power passed from Śāḷuva Narasimha to Tuḷuva Narasa, but there was to be a titular Emperor and his comparatively unimportant element complicates the problem which otherwise would have been far simpler, and easier of solution. It has already been pointed out that Śāḷuva Narasinga's usurpation took place some time between Friday, July 29, 1485, and November 1, 1486, on which date a record of his gives him the paramount titles of sovereignty. He ruled as Emperor for a period of about seven years. Nuniz term of forty-four years for his reign seems to include in it the whole term of his career, first as ruler of Chandragiri and then the Emperor of Vijayanagar itself, that is, practically from the date that Mallikārjuna ascended the throne of Vijayanagar. The first available records of Immaḍi Narasinga Rāya with the titles of paramount sovereignty happen to be dated January 27, A.D. 1493, and give him the style of designation '*Śrīman*

Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara, Paschimasamudrādhipati Kaṭṭāri Śāḷuva Yimmaḍi Narasinga Rāyaru.' He must have come to the throne some time before this date.

Bahmani History of the Period.—We must now turn our attention to the affairs of the Bahmani kingdom before making an extract from Ferishta which confirms this dating according to the inscriptions. Sultan Mahamad Shah II returned from the great raid upon Kanchi and his return was the signal for the mischief to get afoot against the Khwaja Jahan Muhammad Gawan against whom suspicions had been aroused in the mind of the Sultan during his campaigning on the Telingana coast, as the outcome of the jealousy and prejudice against the minister. Muhammad Gawan was assassinated in A.D. 1481 and the Sultan himself died the next year leaving the throne to his young son who ascended the throne as Sultan Mahmud Shah.

At this time the party of the Turks had the ascendency in the State as against the other two parties, the Dakhanis and the Habshis (Abyssinians). The Dakhanis at the head of whom stood Nizam-ul-Mulk Bahri, a Brahman convert from Telingana, devised a plot and got rid of the most influential among the Turks by a general massacre of the Turki noblemen and officials in the capital. Nizam-ul-Mulk Bahri then became Malik Naib (the Prime Minister). There was naturally a rebellion of the Turki governors in distant provinces, who attacked the capital at the head of their armies. The capital and the king were saved by the timely arrival of Ahmad Nizam-ul-Mulk Bahri the son of the Malik Naib. It was now the turn of the Habshis at

court to gain the ear of the Sultan and the Dakhani Malik Naib felt himself in danger and fled for safety to the capital from Warangal where the king was at the time in the course of an invasion. This Malik Naib was killed by Pasand Khan with the sanction of the king. The Habshis got all the positions of power and influence in their hands and ruled in utter disregard of the Sultan who intrigued with the Turks in consequence. When the Habshis besieged the Sultan in the fortress, he was just able to save himself by the strenuous exertions of a handful of Turks. It was at this time that Kasim Barid Turk set up the standard of revolt, and having overcome Dilawar Khan Habshi who was sent against him, threatened the capital itself. His rebellion was the signal for other chiefs to rebel likewise. The Sultan finding it impossible to suppress the rebel Turks entered into a treaty with Kasim Barid giving him the rank of Mir-i-Jumla and making him the *de facto* ruler of the Dakhan. Various governors of provinces refused to recognize this arrangement with the prominent exception of Ahmad Bahri Nizam-ul-Mulk. The king could not dismiss Kasim Barid as the allied rebels demanded, and war had to be continued. Kasim Barid was defeated and put to flight and the rebel chiefs and allies returned each to his headquarters. From this time is dated the founding of the Barid Shahi dynasty of Bider and the overthrow of the Bahmani kingdom as such, and the date of this according to Ferishta would be previous to A.D. 1489, the Burhan-i-Mâasir not having a regular date-scheme for this period.

The remaining period of Mahmad Shah Bahmani's reign which ended in A.D. 1518 is occupied with the

continual struggles of the king to recover lost power. This took the form of his intriguing with the five chieftains in turn and trying various combinations.

All this ended only in making the four States other than Bider to consolidate their power and become independent of headquarters even in respect of form. Vijayanagar was left all through this struggle for power and possession of the king, to deal with Bijapur separately, and this course was made the easier by the jealousies of the three neighbouring states of Golkonda, Bijapur and Ahmadnagar.

Ferishta.—Turning to Ferishta we have it that Yusuf Adil Shah and Mallik Ahmad Bary (Bahri) 'caused the Khootba to be read in their name in A.D. 1489 (A.H. 895)'. 'He wrested many forts from the governors of Mahmud Shah, and subdued all the country from the river Bheema to Bijapur. 'Kaseem Bareed Toork (the *de facto* ruler under the Sultan) who had himself entertained hopes of founding a kingdom at Bijapur, wrote to the Ray of Beejanagar that Mahmud Shah was willing to cede to him the forts of Moodkal and Rachore if he would wrest them from Yusuf Adil Khan, at the same time letters were addressed to Bahadur Geelany, who possessed Goa and Dureabar (the tract, which in the language of Dekhan is called Concan) inviting him to invade the country of Yusuf Adil Khan.

Timraj, the general of the Ray of Beejanagar, having crossed the river Toongabadra, laid waste the country as far as Mudkul and Rachore, and Bahadur Geelany, reduced

the fortress of Jumkindy. Yoosoof Adil Khan was too weak to repel these attacks by force. He accordingly made peace with Timraj, and expelled Bahadur Geelany from his dominions; but, without attempting to recover Jumkindy, led his army, composed of eight thousand foreigners towards the capital against Kaseem Bareed '.

According to one account that Ferishta records the Adil Shah was defeated, had to make peace with his enemies and retire to Bijapur. It was then, 'On learning that dissentions prevailed in Beejanagar, he marched to retake Rachore. On reaching the banks of the Krishna, Adil Shah fell ill of fever brought on by exertion in hunting, and was confined to bed for two months. 'In this interval Timraj, the minister having composed his disputes with the young Ray of Beejanagar, advanced at the head of an army to Rachore, which struck terror into that of Yusuf Adil Khan for whose recovery, fervent prayers were offered up by his subjects.'

'Meanwhile intelligence was received that Timraj having crossed the Toongabadra, was advancing to Beejapur. Yusuf Adil Khan numbered his troops and found them to consist of eight thousand Doaspa* horse and two hundred elephants of all sizes.' Timraj won in the battle which was fought on a Saturday, in April, 1493, but his army engaged in plunder was put to flight by a charge of Adil Khan's forces which he rallied and brought into action on hearing that the Vijayanagar forces were engaged in plundering the camp. Timraj and the young Ray fled to Beejanaggar.

* Double-horsed cavalry.

The latter died on the road of wounds received in the action and Timraj seized the Government of the country; but some of the principal nobility opposing his usurpation, dissentions broke out, which gave Yusuf Adil Khan a respite from war in that quarter.'

'Dustoor Khan relates, that the victory was gained by the following strategem. Yusuf Adil Khan, after the disorder of his troops, sent a messenger to Timraj entreating peace and offering to acknowledge allegiance to the Ray for the country he held; upon which the minister and the Ray came, attended by three or four hundred followers and their principal nobility, to a conference in the field, when Yusuf Adil Khan fell upon them by surprise with his whole army and routed them, killing seventy persons of rank. Their troops alarmed at the death of their chiefs, fled and left the camp to be plundered by the victors.' Yusuf Khan then reduced Mudkul and Rachore, which added largely to his power and wealth.

It can be seen from the extracts above that all these transactions took place between the years 1489 and 1493. In spite of the blundering of Ferishta in regard to the name Timraj, it was the minister that figured in the earlier war consequent upon Kasim Barid's move against Adil Shah. In the battle itself it was the young king that figures with the minister who was able to advance after settling some dissensions which arose at headquarters consequent on a new succession obviously. It must be noted that the young king, the misunderstanding between whom and the minister had to be composed before the general could advance, died of the wounds he received in battle in April, 1493.

Nuniz.—Let us now turn to Nuniz.

'At that time a captain who wished him ill, determined to kill the prince, with a view afterwards to say that Narasenaque had bidden him commit the murder, he being the minister to whom the government of the kingdom had been entrusted, and he thought that for this act of treason Narasenaque would be put to death. And he soon so arranged it that the prince was killed one night by one of his pages who had been bribed for that purpose, and who slew the prince with a sword. As soon as Narasenaque heard that he was dead, and learned that he himself (was supposed to have) sent to kill him, he raised up another brother of the late king's to be king, not being able to further punish this captain, because he had many relations, until after he had raised this younger brother to be king, who was called Tamarao. He (Narasenaque) went out one day from the city of Bisnaga towards Nagumdym saying that he was going hunting leaving all his household in the city. And after he had arrived at this city of Nagumdym he betook himself to another called Penagumdim, which is four and twenty leagues from that place, where he at once made ready large forces and many horses and elephants, and then sent to tell the King Tamarao of the cause of his going; relating to him the treason that that captain by name Timarasa had carried out slaying his brother the king, and by whose death he (the prince) had inherited the kingdom. He told him how that the kingdom had been entrusted to him by his father, as well as the care of himself and his brother, that as this man had killed his brother, so he would do to him in the same way, for he was a traitor; and he urged that for that reason it was necessary to punish

him. But the king at that time was very fond of that captain, since by reason of him he had become king, and in place of punishing him he bestowed favour on him and took his part against the minister. And, seeing this, Narasenaque went against him with large forces, and besieged him, threatening him for four or five days, until the king, seeing his determination, commanded Timarasa to be put to death; after which he (the king) sent the (traitor's) head to be shown to the minister, who greatly rejoiced. Narasenaque sent away all the troops and entered the city, where he was very well received by all the people, by whom he was much loved as being a man of much justice.'

These two accounts differ in essential particulars to such an extent that preferring either to the other would be a matter of considerable difficulty. According to Ferishta Timraj (which stands for Heemraj of Scott's translation and Narasa of the Inscriptions), had to act once at the instance of Kasim Barid and that must have been in behalf of Narasinga or Narasimha I soon after A. D. 1489. The next time the Adil Shah marched against Vijayanagar having heard of dissensions in the city. The Adil Shah having fallen ill for two months, Timraj had time to compose the dissensions at headquarters and march to meet the enemy. The battle was fought on a Saturday in April, A.D. 1493. The young king died of the wounds he received in the battle.

Inscriptions.—Turning to the inscriptions we find that the first record of Narasimha II is dated A.D. 1493 (Śaka 1414, Kolar 34) and the earliest in all probability were those dated January 27, A.D. 1493 (Mudegere 54 and 56). In

these and others up to one of date Wednesday, September 25, A.D. 1493, Narasimha II, is referred to as ruling with various titles but without those distinctly characteristic of the ruling sovereign, namely, *Mahārājādhirāja*, *Rājaparamēśvara*, etc. Records of December 18, A.D. 1493 (Doḍḍaballāpūr 42 and 45) are the first in which these supreme titles appear before the name of Narasimha II, thereby indicating that he became the supreme ruler between September 25 and December 18 of A.D. 1493. These records seem to bear out Ferishta's account in all its details. Narasinga I, must have died either at the end of A.D. 1492 or the beginning of the following year, at any rate before January 27 of A.D. 1493. The general Narasa under the testament recorded by Nuniz, perhaps preferred Narasimha II, to his elder brother and nominated him. This would create an opposition and there would have been dissensions consequent upon this division among the powerful nobles and generals of Vijayanagar, the first prince himself actively declining to be set aside. Narasa composed the difficulties by accepting the elder brother for the time being, the younger having his own following in the provinces directly under Narasa. When the first prince died as a result of the wounds he received in the battle of April, 1493, Narasimha II, must have succeeded to the throne. Hence the assumption of full royal titles in the records of December of that year.

It is just possible that the opposing faction tried to foist the blame for the death of the first prince upon Narasa and even poisoned the mind of the young king against him. It may also be that Timmarasa, the Tymarasa of Nuniz, was the man primarily responsible for this nefarious act. Narasa

Nāyaka sought his own safety in retiring to Penugoṇḍa, and then marched upon the capital not to permit of repetition of the evils of incompetent rule in Vijayanagar. Information of these complicated transactions must have reached Nuniz through informants not remarkable for accuracy in regard to details as has been only too evident in respect of his account so far. It is quite possible that Ferishta lighted upon a correct record of these in the archives of Bijapur which must have had accurate information as the Adil Shah made the movements of his army depend upon information furnished by his intelligence department.

Narasimha II.—Narasimha II came to the throne between the months of September and December, 1493, his elder brother having died in the course of the year not by assassination but as a result of wounds he received in battle. Whatever was the actual nature of this succession, the real power was actually in the hands of Narasa Nāyaka, according to the testament of Śāḷuva Narasimha I and the actual needs of the empire at the time. As Mr. Krishna Sastri says, 'In the records of Immaḍi Narasimha the place of honour is generally given to Narasaṇa-Nāyaka who is invariably referred to, either as a *generalissimo* in charge of the whole army of the Vijayanagar kingdom, or as an agent managing the State affairs for Immaḍi Narasimha from the capital Vijayanagara. Records of the latter are found distributed over the Cuddapah, Anantapur, South Canara, Trichinopoly and Madura districts of the Madras Presidency, and the Mysore State. Under orders of the "Lord" Narasaṇa-Nāyaka, the province of Bārakūr was at the time governed by Sādhāraṇade (va) Voḍeya,

Nagira Rājya which included within it Haiva and Konkana, was in charge of the Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Śāḷuva Dēva Rāya Voḍeya who in Śaka 1422 made a grant, for his own merit, to the temple of Dhārēśvara in the Kumpta Taluka of the North Canara district, *and in Śaka 1424, made another gift to the same temple for the "longevity, health, wealth, kingdom and victory",* of *Mēdinī-Mīsara-Gaṇḍa Kaṭṭāri, Trinētra-Śāḷuva Narasaṇa Nāyaka*, son of *Yīśarappa Nāyaka* (i.e. Īśvarappa). It is this particular statement in the particular record that has been laid hold of to warrant the inference that before Śaka 1424 or A.D. 1502 Narasaṇa Nāyaka superseded Immaḍi Narasimha on the throne. We have seen already that Mr. Sewell calls this inference into question from the chronology point of view. In the words of the epigraphist himself, "The fact that a local chief named Dēvarasa Voḍeya, who had previously made a gift to the temple at Dhārēśvara in the Bombay Presidency for his own merit, supplemented it in A.D. 1501–2 by another endowment for the merit of Narasaṇa Nāyaka, may be taken to show that the second usurpation (i.e. the usurpation by the Tuḷuvas) of the Vijayanagara sovereignty was accomplished in A.D. 1501–2, or immediately before that date."* This reasoning has nothing to support it. There are numbers of records in which various officers of Śāḷuva Narasimha made grants for his merit, and he himself returned the compliment to some, among whom was Narasa himself. Dēvarasa Voḍeya making a grant for his merit first and for the merit of Narasa a few years after, it may be on a particular occasion when he received signal honour or approbation, or when

* **Epigraphist's Report for 1905-6, p. 85, para 58.**

Narasa was on a victorious campaign, cannot be made to bear this weighty inference. The very records are against it. There is not a single record of Narasa giving him the titles of sovereignty, except the Śāḷuva titles which are ascribed to him and which he perhaps assumed as an honour to the ruling family or which were conferred upon him out of regard for the very loyal service he rendered to his master and his sons during a life-time. A glance down the list of inscriptions appended will show that such grants were made for the merit of Narasa Nāyaka while Immaḍi Narasinga Rāya was still ruling. In this connexion No. 445 of 1913 has been drawn into service to support this contention because of the expression "in order that *svāmi* Narasa Nāyaka may be victorious". Svāmi (Lord) does not imply necessarily ruler. Every one is *svāmi* to his servants. No. 357 of 1912 has been brought in also to prove that the second usurpation so called took place in A.D. 1501-2, on the strength of the expression "Svāmi Narasa Nāyaka went to Śivalōka (died)". There is nothing in it to indicate that this was the great general, and, what is worse for the case, there are grants of subsequent dates in which he is indicated as unmistakably alive. No. 395 of 1912 is a grant by an agent of Narasa Nāyaka. There is so far no definite piece of evidence that Narasa usurped the throne setting aside Immaḍi Narasimha who made the Dēvulappalle grant of A.D. 1504 and whose name is mentioned in various other grants up to, and even beyond A.D. 1505 in which year in all probability Narasa Nāyaka died, as Gōribidanūr 77 and No. 177 of 1913 would seem to indicate clearly. The first is a record of Vīra Narasimha, son of Narasa, and the second records a gift by king

Vīra Narasimha for the merit of his father Narasa Nāyiningāru. That Narasa was ever the sovereign on the throne of Vijayanagar seems thus to rest upon no foundation of fact.

Narasa, de facto Ruler.—He was however, the *de facto* ruler from A.D. 1493 to 1505 and kept the Empire from breaking up by putting down internal rebellion on the one hand, and keeping out the Adil Shah on the other. His actual achievements are described in the copper-plate grants of his sons in some detail and the following is from some of them :—

'Damming up the Kavery in full flood, he crossed over and capturing his enemy alive, seized his kingdom and taking possession of Śrirangapaṭṭaṇa, erected there the pillar of his fame.' *

'Having conquered Gajapati Rāya, he won by his valour the title Gajapati *Rāyēbha-Gaṇḍabhēruṇḍa* (a two-headed eagle to the elephant Gajapati Rāya). Having conquered the mighty fierce Turushka king in battle, he gained the "title *dushṭā rāṇ mriga*" *Śārdūla* (a tiger to the deer, wicked kings). Having defeated the Madhura

---

* '*Kavērīm āśu badhva bahuḷa-jala-rayām tām vilanghyaiva Śatrum*
Jīvagrāham grihītva samiti bhuja-balāt tam charājyam tadīyam.
Kṛitva Śrīrangapūrvam tad api nija vaśē paṭṭaṇam yō babhāsē
Kīrti stambham nikhāya tri-bhuvana bhavana stūyamānāpadānah.'

(Guṇḍlupet 30, Epigraphia Carnataka, Vol. iv, Part II.)

king Mānabhūpa in battle, he forced the Pāṇḍya, Chōḷa Chera and other kings to pay tribute.' *

Mr. Krishna Sastri's Findings.—Having come so far we are face to face with the statement made by Mr. Krishna Sastri; 'In the copper-plate grant form Dhārēśvara noted already, Śāḷuva-Narasaṇa (i.e. Narasa) Nāyaka, son of Yīśvarappa (Īśvara) Nāyaka, is referred to as still living in Śaka 1424, Durmati the month Bhādrapada, whereas in a record from Bārakūru,† dated in the same Śaka year Durmati, but in the month Māgha, we are informed that Vīra Narasinga Rāya was ruling from the throne of Vijayanagara. Consequently, we have, perhaps, to infer that Narasa died in the latter part of Śaka 1424 and left his son Vīra Narasimha to succeed to the throne.'‡

Criticism of the Findings.—We have not in the Epigrapist's published list the detail here given from No. 152 of 1901; but we have no reason to call the Epigraphist's statement into question in regard to the fact. The inference, however, seems quite unwarranted. Nos. 57, 59, 60 and 61 of the appendix, all of them imply that Narasa Nāyaka was alive later than the date given above, and

---

* *Jitva Gajapatim Rāyam birudam prāpa sāhasāt*
Gajapatyākhya Rāyēbha gaṇḍa bhēruṇḍa ityamum
Pratāpōgram Turushkēndram yuddē jitva parākramāt
Dushṭa rāṇ mriga Śārdūla ityādi birudān agāt
Madhura vallabham Māna-bhūpam nirjitya samyugē
Karadīkṛitvān Pāṇḍya-Chōḷa-Cherādi bhūpatim.

(Gōribidanūr 77, Epigraphia Carnataka, Vol. x.)

† Epigraphist's Collection, No. 152 of 1901.

‡ *A.S.R.* 1907-8, p. 171.

hence the Vīra-Narasinga Rāya said to have been ruling from the throne of Vijayanagara must be Immaḍi Narasimha who, about this period, got into a fancy for other titles than those that were his own. No. 63 of the appendix gives the Hoysala title Bhujabala to Śāḷuva Narasimha I; No. 57 gives the titles specially applicable to Dēva Rāya II to what appears to be Narasaṇa, that is, the general Narasa; No. 68 calls Narasaṇṇa chief among the officers of *Vidyānagara simhāsanārūḍa Bhujabalapratāpa Narasimha* who was then on the throne of Vidhyānagara or Vijayanagar. This is of date March 10, 1506, according to Sewell.

Narasa Nāyaka then did not die in A.D. 1502, nor was Immaḍi Narasimha set aside by him as far as the evidence available can take us. Narasa, the general-in-chief and regent died as such in 1505 as was already indicated and was succeeded in his position by his son who assumed the supreme titles in Maḷavalli 95 of date December 15, 1506, so that it is clear that for same some time after the death of his father he went on in subordination, however nominal, to the titular monarch for the time being.

Immaḍi Narasimha's records are found as late as 1507 (75 and 76 of appendix) and then cease. It is only some of the copper-plate grants of Narasa's sons that credit him with having occupied the throne of Vijayanagar, but they do this honour even to his father Īśvara, who could not have had any occasion for doing so. Nuniz story about the setting aside of Immaḍi Narasimha and his subsequent murder during the life-time of Narasa is not supported by any evidence from these records. His chronology need not, therefore, be attached the importance that

it has been accorded. The probabilities are that Vīra Narasimha, son of Narasa set him aside completely and even got rid of him in the manner described by Nuniz and believed to be supported by the Muhammadan historains.

Vira Narasimha, the Second Usurper.—Of Vīra Narasimha Rāya, Narasa's son and successor, Nuniz has :— ' And this king left at his death five sons ; one was called Busbalrao, and another Crismarao, and another Tetarao, and another Ramygupa and another Ouamysyuaya.

And this Busbalrao inherited the kingdom at the death of his father Narasenaque and reigned six years, during which he was always at war, for as soon as his father was dead the whole land revolted under its captains ; who in a short time were destroyed by that king, and their lands taken and reduced under his rule. During these six years the king spent, in restoring the country to its former condition, eight million gold *pardaos*. This king died of his sickness in the city of Bisnaga. Mr. Krishna Sastri says, ' We have not on record many inscriptions of Vīra Narasimha Rāya. Those mentioned by Mr. Sewell have not yet been critically examined. Three records from Bārakūru (South Canara), Tāḍpatri (Anantapur) and Jambai (South Arcot) mention a few of Vira Narasimha's subordinates. These were Basavarasa Oḍeya ruling the Bārakūru-rājya, the *Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara* Rāmayaśōḻa-Mahārāja, one of the Uraiyūr Chōḻas of the Solar race and Śāḷuva Timmarasa, the *mahāpradhāna* of the king, At Rāmēśvaram near Proddaṭūr (Cuddapah) is a record dated in Śaka 1430, Vibhava, which does not refer to any ruling king, but mentions gifts made to the temple of Rāmayadēva by Śāḷuva Gōvindarāja,

son of Rāchirāja of the Kauṇḍinya-*gōtra* Āpastamba *sūtra* and the Yajus-*śākha*, for the merit of Vīra Narasimha Rāya and Śāḷuva Timmayya. On Friday, the 15th *tithi* of the bright half of Viśāka in the Śaka year 1431, Śukla, Vīra Narasimha Rāya was still ruling at Vijayanagara, when his *mahāpradhāna* Śāḷuva-Timmayyangārù made a grant of village in Guttirājya to the temple of Rāmēśvara at Tāḍiparati. This Śāḷuva Timmayya, of whom more will be said in the sequel, is the famous minister who played so prominent a part in state politics during the reigns of Vīra Narasimha Rāya and his successor, the great Krishna Rāya. Śāḷuva Timma's parentage, as given in the Koṇḍavīḍu inscription shows that Śāḷuva Gōvindarāja of the Rāmēśvaram and Mōpūr records must have been indentical with the Gaundajo or Gandarajo mentioned by Nuniz as a brother of Śāḷuva Timma and holding an important executive position in one of the provinces of Vijayanagar Empire.

Before going into the reign of Krishna Rāya it may be useful to see what copper-plates and Nuniz have to say about Vīra Narasimha. The former praise him as a virtuous king who made gifts at various sacred places, such as Rāmēśvaram, Śrīrangam, Kumbakōṇam, Chidambaram, Śōnaśila (Tiruvaṇṇāmalai), Kanchi, Kāḷahasti, Śrīśaila, Ahōbala, Mahānandi, Nivritti, Harihara and Gōkarṇa. But Nuniz says that during the six years of his rule Busbalrao was always at war; for as soon as his father was dead the whole land revolted under its captains; and that about the time of his death, in order to secure the throne for his own son, he issued the cruel order that the eyes of his step brother Krishna Rāya should be put out. Whatever the estimate of Nuniz may be of Vīra Narasimha's

character he seems to be certainly right when he says that the whole land revolted on Narasa Nāyaka's death. In an inscription from the Kaḍūr district (Mysore), we are told of an expedition carried into the Tuḷu-rājya by Bhujabala Mahārāya (i.e. Busbalrao) in order perhaps to quell the rebellious feudatories of that province, one of whom at least, the Kalasa Karkala chief Yimmaḍi-Bhairarasa-Oḍeya is stated in the record to have been quite anxious about the continuance of his petty estate.

The Mussalman Governor at Goa, according to the Italian traveller Varthema, was at war with Narasimha of Vijayanagara, about the year A.D. 1506. The Ummattūr chiefs in the eastern part of the Mysore country must also have grown powerful, if they had not actually revolted, and must have held permanent rule (*sthirarājya*) at Terukaṇambi (Guṇḍlupet Tāluka) and the surrounding country. Other petty chieftains of Mysore also cannot have kept the peace; else, as we shall see in the sequel there would have been no necessity for Krishna Rāya to have gone on a victorious tour immediately after his coronation to put down these petty rulers. For the same reason, too, we may not be far wrong if we infer that the Gajapati king had carried his influence far into the interior of the Vijayanagara kingdom and had held the fortresses of Koṇḍavīḍu and Udayagiri which were situated in the Karṇāṭa country. The Muhammadan kings of Bijapur also could not but have found the Tuḷuva usurpation by Narasaṇa Nāyaka, or rather, by his son Vīra Narasimha Rāya a favourable opportunity to pounce once again on their natural enemies, the Hindu kings of Vijayanagara.

General rebellion at Vīra Narasimha's accession.—From these extracts it is clear that Vīra Narasimha's accession was the signal for a general rebellion in the provinces probably because of the innovation to set aside the titular ruler Immaḍi Narasimha. He was able to regain for the empire some at any rate of the rebel provinces, though he left some to his successor to bring under allegiance. Vīra Narasimha thus succeeded to power some time in A.D. 1505 and to the position of Emperor perhaps some time after, giving rise to the series of rebellions of the more distant provinces. The short period of his rule did not permit of his bringing all of them back to their allegiance, and he had to bequeath to his successor not only the empire but also the responsibility of keeping it from dismemberment by rebellion within, and by the ceaseless advances of the last great Gajapati Pratāpa Rudra whom we hear of about this time in posession of Udayagiri.

Conclusions.—Our investigations then lead us to this conclusion in regard to the second part of the problem we set to ourselves in the extracts from Sewell with which we began the enquiry. Śāḷuva Narasinga's usurpation took place in A.D. 1485–6 as the inevitable result of misrule and usurpation in Vijayanagar before him. He took upon himself the responsibilities from no unworthy motives of personal greed or even mere dynastic ambition. Far rather the dominant motive seems to have been the preservation of the empire from dismemberment. He passed this motive and his real power and his responsibilities to his veteran general Narasa, who carried out loyally what was bequeathed to him, the command of power and the responsibilities

7

involved in this, by placing on the throne the son of his master but carrying on the administration himself to the day of his death in A.D. 1505. His son Vīra Narasimha succeeded to his power immediately, and to the throne a little later to the detriment of the empire which could be preserved from dismemberment only by the indomitable energy and the effective warring of his successor brother King Krishna Dēva Rāya who came to the throne about the end of the year 1509.

[*A lecture delivered before the Madras Literary Society and Auxiliary of the Royal Asiatic Society with His Excellency Lord Pentland in the Chair* (*19-11-1915*).]

PEDIGREE OF THE ŚĀḶUVAS

Moon
- Buddha
  - Purūravas
    - Vankidēva
      - Guṇḍa I m. Kamalādēvi
        - Guṇḍa II, Bomma
        - Madirāja
        - Gauta I
        - Vīrahōbala
        - Savitri-Manji.
        - Śāḷuva Mangi or Mangu (Śaka 1285; a probable contemporary of Samparāya, the father of Telunga; and a general of the Vijayanagara prince Kumāra Kampa)
          - Gauta II (one of six sons)

- Gauta II (one of six sons)
  - Guṇḍa III m. Mallāmbikā
    - Timma (Śaka 1385)
    - Nṛsimharāya (Narasinga); m. Śrīrangamāmba (Śaka 1378-1408)
      - Not named (killed by a ganeral called Tymarasa as stated by Nuniz)
      - Immaḍi Nṛsimha, Dharmarāya, Tammayyadēva or Tammadēva-Mahārāya (Tamarao) (Śaka 1414-1427)
  - Śāḷuva
    - Parvatarāja (Śāka 1378)
  - Boppa
  - Tippa or Tipparāja, brother-in-law of the Vijayanagara king Dēvarāya II (Śaka 1352-1364)
    - Gōpa or Goppa (Śaka 1352)
      - Timma or Tirumali Dēva Mahārāja (Śaka 1375-1385)
      - Tippa or Tripurāntaka, (Śaka 1390)

APPENDIX

(1) Śaka 1378. Dhātri. A.D. 1456.	Tirumalai (Tirupati), 253 of 1904.	Narasingadēva Mahārāja, son of Guṇḍaiyadēva Mahārāja.	Gift of Ālipuram in Vaikuṇḍa Vaḷanāḍu (a subdivision) of Chandragirirājya.
(2) Śaka 1381. Pramāthin. A.D. 1459.	Kāvirippākkam, 392 of 1905.	Mallikārjuna, son of Vīrapratāpadēva Mahārāya.	Gift for the merit of Narasingarāja Uḍaiyār; refers to the Mahāsabhai of Kāvirippākkam.
(3) Śaka 1385. Subhānu. A.D. 1463.	Tirumalai (Tirupati) 249 of 1904.	Tirumalaidēva Mahārāja, son of Guṇḍarāja Uḍaiyār.	Gift for the merit of Narasingarāja Uḍaiyār.
(4) Śaka 1388. A.D. 1466.	Kolar 33.	Kaṭṭāri Sāḷuva Narasimha.	Restores grants of Rājēndra Chōḻa and Vīra Baḷḷāḷa.
(5) Śaka 1389. Sarvajit. A.D. 1467.	Tirumalai (Tirupati), 250 of 1904.	Narasingadēvaiya Mahārāja Uḍaiyar, son of Guṇḍaiyadēva Mahārāja Uḍaiyār.	Gift of five villages to the temple.
(6) Śaka 1393. Jyēshṭa. Śukla 15 Śukravāra Sōmōparāga (Eclipse of the moon), A.D. 1471.	Nāgamangala 79.	Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Mēdinīmisaragaṇḍa Kaṭṭāri Sāḷuva Narasingayyadēva Mahā arasugaḷu, etc.	No. 59 in the same place gives the first title Medinī *mīseyaragaṇḍa*.

(7) Śaka 1393. expired, Vikrita. A.D. 1471.	Tirukoilūr.	Śāḷuvagaṇḍa Kaṭṭāri Śāḷuva Narasimhadēva Mahārāja.	Repairs to the outer wall and the gōpura by Aṇṇamarasa.
(8) Śaka 1394. Nandana. A.D. 1472.	Villiyanallūr.	Virūpāksharāya, son of Dēvarāya.	Gift of land for the merit of Śāḷuva Narasimharāya.
(9) Śaka 1400. Viḷambi. Chaitra, Śu 10. A.D. 1478.	Chennapaṭna 158.	Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara, Mēdinīmīsaragaṇḍa Kaṭṭāri Śāḷuva Śāḷuva Narasingarāya.	A number of Voḍeyārs made a grant for the merit of Narasinga.
(10) Śaka 1403. Plava current. Jyēshṭa, Śu. 10. A.D. 1481.	Kānkānhalli 8.	Mahāmaṇḍalika Śāḷuva Narasimha.	'Namma Channapaṭnada Rājyakke'. Our Channapaṭna Province.
(11) Śaka 1403. A.D. 1481.	Anbil, 594 of 1902.	Śāḷuva Sangamadēva Mahārāya.	...
(12) Śaka 1405. Śōbhakrit (expired) ought to be current, A.D, 1482, 83 or 84 (S).	Gangaikoṇḍśōḻapuram, 83 of 1893.	Virūpāksharāya.	...
(13) Seems Śaka 1405. Śōbhakrit. A.D. 1483.	Tiruvakkarai, 318 of 1909.	Sāḷuva Narasinga Rāya I.	Mentions a Nāgama Nāyaka foremost of his servants.

(14) Śaka (1404?) Śōbhakrit. A.D. 1482-83 (S).	Tiruvakkarai, 198 of 1904.	Narasingadēva.	Narasa Nāyaka, an agent of the *King*, renewing revision of a tax.
(15) Śaka 1406. A.D. 1484.	Māgaḍi 32.	Kaṭṭāri Śāḷuva Narasinga.	...
(16) Śaka 1406. Saumya (wrong) A.D. 1484.	Tirukkachchūr, 318 of 1909.	Śāḷuva Narasinga Rāya I.	Mentions Nāgama Nāyaka foremost of his servants.
(17) Śaka 1407. Visvāvasu, Śravaṇa ba 2, Ādivāra (?) Friday, July 9, 1485 (S).	Mulbāgal 104.	Virūpāksharāya Mahārāya ruling, under the Government of Narasimha Rāja Voḍeyār.	...
(18) Śaka 1408. Parābhava. A.D. 1486.	Anbil, 593 of 1902.	Dēvarāya Mahārāya Virūpāksharāya Prauḍhadēva Mahārāya.	Gift of land by Śāḷuva Sangama.
(19) Śaka 1408. Parābhava, Kārtika Śukla 5. Nov. 1. 1486 (S).	Tumkur 54.	Śrīmad Rājādhirāja Rāja Paramēśvara prauḍhapratāpa Narasingarāyaru Vidyānagaradali Vajrasimhāsanārūḍhar āgi prithviyam āḷuva rāyara appaṇeyalu.	...
(20) Śaka 1412. A.D. 1490.	Bowringpet 14.	Kaṭṭāri Śāḷuva.	...

(21) Śaka 1414. (?) A.D. 1493.	Kolar 34.	Immaḍi Narasimha.	Refers to Narasingadēva Arasugaḷu, son of Chikka Timma Arasugaḷu. (Immaḍi is obliterated.)
(22) Śaka 1414, Parīdhāvi, Māgha, Śu. 10. Sunday, Jan. 27, A.D. 1493.	Mudegere 54.	Śrīman Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Paschimasamudhrādhipati Kaṭṭāri Śāḷuva Yimmaḍi Narasinga Rāyaru.	...
...	Mudegere 56.	(Same as above)	...
(23) Śaka 1414, Parīdhāvi. A.D. 1493.	Pūrattukōvil, 736 of 1909.	Bhujabalarāya.	...
(24) Śaka 1415. A.D. 1493, Wed., Sep. 25.	Gōribidanūr 80.	Immaḍi Narasimha with only Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara.	Gift by Kēśava Nāyaka for the merit of Immaḍi Narasinga Rāya Mahārāya.
(25) Śaka 1415, Sarvajit by mistake for Pramādīcha Pushya Śukla 10. Dec. 18, 1493.	Doḍḍaballāpur 42 and 45.	Śrīman Mahārājādhirāja, Rāja Paramēśvara, Medinīmīsaragaṇḍa Kaṭṭāri Śāḷuva. Śāḷuva Immaḍi Rāya Mahārāya with supreme titles, (Grant on Makarasankarānti.)	Prince Śāḷuva Dēvappa Nāyaka, Governor of Tippūr.

(26) Śaka 1415, Pramādhin by mistake for Pramādhīcha ? A.D. 1493.	Muttukūru, Cuddapah District, 516 of 1906.	Śāḷuva Immaḍi Narasinga Rāya Mahārāya, son of Śāḷuva Narasingadēva Mahārāya.	The king is *said* to have been *ruling at Vijyanagar*. Gift of taxes in Muttukūru to Channakēśava temple by a servant of *Narasanāyiningāru* a *subordinate* of the king.
(27) Śaka 1414 (?), Ānanda, Pushya, ba. 5 (ought to be Śaka 1416. Jan. 15, 1495.) (S).	Kolar 34.	Immaḍi Narasimha Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Medinīmīsaragaṇḍa Kaṭṭāri Śāḷuva Immaḍi Narasinga Rāya Mahārāyaru.	Refers to Narasingadēva Arasugaḷu, son of Chikka Timma Arasugaḷu.
(28) Śaka 1416. Pramādīcha Viśāka bahuḷa 14. A.D. 1494.	Muḍegere 50.	Śrīman Mahāmaṇḍalēsvara Paschimasamudrādipati Yimmaḍi Narasingarāyaru.	...
(29) Śaka 1416. Ānanda, Māgha, Śu. 1. Jan. 27, 1495. (S).	Dēvanhaḷḷi 66.	Śrīmanmahāmaṇḍalēśvara............................ ......agrēśvara............... Narasingarāya Mahārāyaru prithivirājyam geyyuttiralu.	...

(30) Śaka 1416, Ānanda, Jyēshṭa, ba. 8. May 29, 1494 (S).	Kuṇigal 26.	Śrīman Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Mēdinī Mīsaragaṇḍa Kaṭṭāri Sāḷuva Sāḷuva Immaḍi Rāya Mahārāyara Komāra Suḷḷiriya Dēvappa Nāyakaru.	...
(31) Śaka 1411, (error for 1416) Rākshasa, Chaitra Śu. 1. A.D. 1494,	Hoskōṭe 23.	Immaḍi Narasingarāya - without any royal titles.	...
(32) Śaka 1417. Rākshasa, Māgha, bahuḷa 14, Śivarātri. Jan. 14, A.D. 1496.	Maddagiri 33.	Śrīman Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Mēdinīmīsaragaṇḍa Kaṭṭāri Sāḷuva Sāḷuva Immaḍi Narasinga Rāyaru Sēnāthipathi Narasaṇṇa Nāyakara baṅṭa, etc.	...
(33) Śaka 1417, Rākshasa, Chaitra, Śu. 1. A.D. 1496.	Bangalore 123.	Immaḍi Narasinga Rāya without any royal titles.	Grant by Anantayyadēva Mahā arasu for the merit of Immaḍi Narasinga.
(34) Śaka 1418. Rākshasa, Māgha, ba. 30. Feb. 13, 1496 (S).	Kolar 1.	Dharma Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara........................... Sāḷuva Yimmaḍi Narasingarāya Mahārāya.	Grant in eclipse of the sun.
(35) Śaka 1418. Rākshasa, Śravaṇa ba. 30. A.D. 1496.	Māgaḍi 31.	Grant for the merit of Immaḍi Narasinga.	...

(36) Śaka 1418. Naḷa, Āsvyūja Su 12. A.D. 1496.	Mysore 33.	Mēdinī mīsara gaṇḍa kaṅthi (kaṭṭāri ?) Śāḷuva Narasinga Rāyara Mahāpradhāna Narasaṇṇa Nāyakaru.	...
(37) Śaka 1420. Pingaḷa Āsvyūja ba 5. A.D. 1498.	Heggaḍedēvanakoṭe, 35 and 36.	...	Narasaṇṇa Nāyakaru Yarama Nāyakaru gave a *sūtra guttagē* of 30 ga of land.
(38) Śaka 1419 or 20 (by mistake 1400) Pingaḷa Vaiśāka Śu. 5 (See Hg. 97 for correction of date) 12th April, A.D. 1498.	Do. 74	Narasingarāya Mahārāya with royal titles as below:— Svasti Samasta bhuvanāśrayam, Śrī-prithvīvallabha Śrīman Mahāmēdinī mīseyaragaṇḍa Kaṭṭāri Śāḷuva Narasingarāya Mahā Rāyara Manēya Pradhāna Tipparasayya.	This officer made a grant to Bāṇēśvara of Magge.
(39) Śaka 1420. Kāḷayukti. A.D. 1498.	Prodduṭṭūru, 386 of 1904.	Śāḷuva Narasimha Nāyiningāru.	Narasa Nāyiningāru is spoken of as a partner (*pampu*) with the Śāḷuva Immaḍi Narasinga Rāya (in the sovereignty of Vijayanagar). Does *Pampu* mean *partner* or *Commissioner* ?

(40) Śaka 1421. Siddhārti, Vaikāśi 5. A.D. 1499.	Mālūr 5.		Śrīman Mahārājādhirāja Rāja Paramēśvara Mēdinī Mīsaragaṇḍa Kaṭṭāri Śāḷuva Narasimharāyar Kāriyattukkukkattan āna Narasa Nāyakkan.	...
(41) Śaka 1421. Siddhārti current Pushya ba 11. Makarasankrānthi. Dec. 28 (?) A.D. 1499.	Heggaḍedēvanakoṭe 59.		...	Grant of Sagarē and another village to the Brahmans, etc., of the locality by Śivanasamudrada Tipparasa with the permission of Narasaṇṇa Nāyaka whose jāgīr Bayānāḍu containing these villages was................
(42) Śaka 1421. A.D. 1499.	Siddhārti.	Manigarakere, 166 of 1901.	Immaḍi Narasinga Rāya.	Gift of land.
(43) Śaka 1421. A.D. 1499.	Siddhārti.	Tiruppattūr, 89 of 1908.	Śāḷuva Immaḍi Narasimha Mahārāya, son of Narasimha Rāya.	Brahmadēya declared free of cess.
(44) Śaka 1422. A.D. 1500.	Siddharti	(Copper-plates.....Lang: Kan, Poona) 31 of 1905-6.	Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Śāḷuva Dēvarāya Voḍeyār ruling Nagira Rājya, Hayiva, Tuḷu, Konkaṇa and other districts.	Gift to Dharanāthadēva of Dhārēśvara.

(45) Śaka 1422. Raudra, Karkāṭaka śudi, 7 Friday *Attam.* A.D. 1500.	Dēvikāpuram, 355 of 1912.	...	Gift of land for the merit of Narasa Nāyaka by Tirumala Nāyaka and Īśvara Nāyaka sons of Ettappa Nāyaka.
(46) Śaka 1422. Raudra. A.D. 1500.	Pirānmalai, 139 of 1903.	Immaḍi Narasimharāya.	Mentions Eppuli Nāyaka.
(47) Śaka 1422, Raudra. A.D. 1500.	Pirānmalai, 151 of 1903.	Śāḷuva Immaḍi Narasinga Rāya.	Gift of land for the merit of Tipparasa by Eppuli Nāyaka.
(48) Śaka 1422, Durmati. A.D. 1501.	Neḍunguḷam, 664 of 1909.	Vīrapratāpa Bhujabala Rāya Immaḍi Tammayyadēva Mahārāya.	Refers to Narasa Nāyakar and to the founding of a village for the merit of Sōmayya Vīramarasa, lord of the southern ocean.
(49) Śaka 1423. Durmati. A.D. 1501.	Nandalūr, 615 of 1907.	Śāḷuva Immaḍi Narasinga Rāya Mahārāya, son of Śāḷuva Narasinga Rāya Mahārāya.	Records a gift for the merit of Narasa Nāyaka Voḍeyār.
(50) Śaka 1423. Āsvyūja, 1502 October 1 (Sewell).	Nagar 73.	Narasinga Rāya Mahārāya's time.	The grant appears to have been for the merit of Narasinga Rāya Narasaṇṇa Nāyaka, etc.

(51) Śaka 1424. (Given by mistake as 1444) Durmati Simhaśudi 10. Monday *hasta*. A.D 1502.	Āragaḷūru, Salem Dt., 445 of 1913.	...	Ammaṇa Nāyaka's grant of *Aḍimaikkāśus* from the *kaikolas* and a female servant 'in order that Svāmi Narasa Nāyaka may be victorious.'
(52) Śaka 1424. Durmati. A.D. 1501-2.	Chauḷikere, near Bārakūr, 152 of 1901.	...	Basavarasoḍeyār, Governor of Bārukūru Rājya.
(53) Śaka 1424. Durmati (current apparently). A.D. 1501-2.	32 of 1905-6. (Same as 31 of 1905-6 above.)	Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Śāḷuva Narasimha Nāyaka.	Gift to the same temple as 46 above by Dēvarasa Voḍeya for the merit of the King. The title Medinīmīsara, Gaṇḍakaṭṭāri, Trinētra Śāḷuva are assumed by the King.
(54) Śaka 1424. Dundhubi, Pushya, ba 5. A.D. 1502.	Nanjanagūḍu 88.	......ha Maṇḍalēśvara bhashege tappuva-rāyara-gaṇḍa arirāyā vibāḍa kaṇḍa nāḍu koṇḍu koṅḍa (nāḍu) koḍāda rāyara gaṇḍa rājādhirāja rāja Paramēśvara kaḍaha...(Śā)ḷuva Nara ...na Nāyakara Manēya śira pradhāna Timmarasayya Tipparasayyaṇa Śira pradhāna Uraḍu Nāyakaru, etc.	Gift of land as a dēvadāna (free gift.)

(55) Śaka 1424. Rudirōdgāri (seems wrong by about a year or two) A.D. 1503.	Same place as above, 450 of 1913.	Tamarāya, son of Śāḷuva Narasinga Rāya.	A grant similar to the above and for the same purpose.
(56) Śaka 1425. Rudirōdgāri, Chaitra, ba. 1 Sōmavāra. A.D. 1503, March 13 (Sewell).	Maddagiri 106.	Śrīmatu mēdinī mīsaragaṇḍa kaṭṭāri Śāḷuva Yimmaḍi Narasingarāya Mahārāyara Kāryakke Kartarāda Narasa Nāyakka Voḍeya Kāryakke Kartar, etc., agent of Narasa who was himself agent or Commissioner of Immaḍi Narasinga Rāya.	...

(167 of 1913 is the same as above almost.)

(57) Śaka 1425, Rudirōdgāri. Śravaṇa Śudi. 15 Monday, A.D. 1503.	Pānem, Nandyal Tq. 166 of 1913.	...	Honnappa Nāyuḍu, son of Bokkasam Dēvappa Nāyuḍu granted for the merit of the *King* and *Narasa Nāyiningāru land* in the village of Pānem, etc. (Donors same as that of 165 of Śaka 1431 of Krishṇadēva).

(58) Śaka 1425. Rudirōdgāri. Mārgaśira ba 10. A.D. 1503.	Krishnarājapet 64.	...	Gopalara...varu Narasaṇṇa Nāyakaru astamanavādāga avarige dharmavāgalendu, etc., gave a *vṛitti* (for the merit of Narasa Nāyaka when he should die).
(59) Śaka 1425. Rudirōdgāri. A.D. 1503.	Brahadāmba temple at Dēvikāpuram, 357 of 1912.	...	Gift of land and a house in the village of Kaitasa to a certain Samarapungava Dīkshita for the merit of (Svāmi) King Narasa Nāyaka who went to Śivalōka (...died), by his subordinates Tirumalai Nāyaka and Īśvara Nāyaka.
(60) Śaka 1426, Raktākshi-Simha. Śudi. 13. A.D. 1504.	Āragal, Salem District, 412 of 1913.	Dharmarāya, son of Sāḷuva Narasinga Bhujabaladēva Mahārāya.	Restoration of village to the temple by Eṛamanchi Tulukāṇa Nāyaka.
(61) Śaka 1426, Raktākshi, Kārtika, Śu. 15. Thursday, eclipse of moon. (Week-day, Wed. eclipse did not occur). A.D. 1504.	Gōribidanūr, 38.	...	Vīrapratāpa Narasinga Rāya made a grant of a village.

(62) Śaka 1426, Raktākshi, kanni. ba. di. 1 Wednesday—aśvati (Wed., 25th September, 1504).	Dēvikāpuram N. Arcot, 395 of 1912.	Immaḍi Narasimha Tammayya Dēva Mahārāya.	Gift of land, etc., by Tirumalai Nāyaka (son of Ettappa Nāyaka) *agent of Narasa Nāyaka.*
(63) Śaka 1426. A.D. 1505, February 2, Sunday (Sewell).	Dēvikāpuram, 396 of 1912 of same date.	Immaḍi Narasimha Rāya Mahārāya, son of Śāḷuva Narasimha Rāya Mahārāya.	...
(64) Śaka 1429 (6?), Raktākshi, Mīna, bah di 10, Friday Uttiram. Uttirāḍa in 1505, February 28 (Sewell).	Dēvikāpuram, North Arcot, 354 of 1912.	Śāḷuva Immaḍi-rāyadēva Mahārāya, son of Narasingarāyadēva Mahārāya.	Registers right of ploughing (Uḻavu kāṇīyātchi).
(65) Śaka 1426, Krōdhana (current). Phālguna, Feb. 23—March 10, 1505 (S).	Guṇḍalpet 67.	Bhujabala pratāpa Narasimha Mahārāyaru.	Seems to refer to Narasaṇṇa as chief among the Officers of Vihyānagara simhāsanārūḍabhujabala, etc.
(66) Śaka 1427, Krōdhana. A.D. 1505.	Muḷubāgal 242.	...	Narasingarāya (rigu) Narasa Nāyakarigu vuttama vāgabēkendu, (that merit may accrue to Narasingarāya and Narasa Nāyakā).

(67) *Sthira bhāgyē Śakasyābdē* (Śaka 1427.) Krōdhana Nabhō māsē paurṇima, śravaṇa, Arka vāsarē, Sunday 24th asterism, full moon Aug. to Sep. of Krōdhana. A.D. 1505, July 16 or Aug. 14, A.D. 1505 (Sewell).	Gōribidanūr 77.	Vīranarasimhēndra, son of Narasa.	States that Narasa, son of Īśvara Bhūpāla ruled efficiently the kingdom seated on the jewelled throne in the excellent city of Vidyānagara built of old by Vidyāraṇya.
(68) Śaka 1428, Krōdhana. A.D. 1505.	Pānem, Nandyal Tq. 171 of 1913.	Vīra Narasimharāya.	Gift by the king for the merit of his father Narasa Nāyiningāru.
(69) Śaka 1428, Kshaya (by error 1427), A.D. 1505. (Possibly the Śaka year was correct and name of the year wrong).	Jyōtipura, Hoskōṭe 121.	Kaṭṭāri Sāḷuva, Sāḷuva Immaḍi Narasinga.	...
(70) Śaka 1428, Kshaya. Dec. 15 1506. (S).	Maḷavaḷḷi 95.	Śrīman Mahārājādhirāja Rāja Paramēśvara Bhujabalapratāpa Narasimha Mahārāyaru Vijayanagariyalli Prithvirājyam geyyuttirkalāgi (ruling the earth with the titles above, in Vijayanagar).	...

(71) Śaka 1429, Kshaya, Pushya. Ravivāsarē, Darśē sūryōparāgē, (eclipse of sun) Jan. 13, 1507 (S).	Nagar 64.	Vīra Narasimha Rājasimhasya Vīra Śrī Narasimhēndra bhūpālasya (of Vīra Srī Narasimha Bhūpāla son of Vīra Nṛsimha Rājasimha).	...
(72) Śaka 1429, Kshaya, Panguni. 2, mīna, su, di. 5. Attam, Sunday, A.D. 1507.	Marudāḍi, N. Arcot, 413 of 1912.	Vīra Narasingadēva Mahārāya, son of Śāḷuva Narasingadēva Mahārāya.	...
(73) Śaka 1429. (expired) Prabhava. A.D. 1507.	Jambai, S. Arcot, 94 of 1906.	Vīra Narasinga Rāya, son of Śāḷuva Narasinga Rāya.	Gift of land by Rāmayya Śōḻa Mahārāja, son of the Uraiyūr Śōḻayya Pottayya Śōḻa-Mahārāya of the solar race and Kaśyapa gōtra.
(74) Śaka 1429, Parābhava māgha. su. 1 Jan. 3, 1508 (S).	Bangalore 52.	Vīrapratāpa Vīra Narasinga Rāya Mahārāya.	...
(75) Śaka 1430, April. 5, 1509 (S).	Mālūr 6.	Vīra Narasimha with royal titles.	Reference to a Hoysala chief.
(76) Śaka 1430, Vibhava, Kumbha, śu. di. 7, Friday. A.D. 1508.	Āragal, Salem Dt., 408 of 1913.	Kumāra Vīra Narasimha Bhujabala Vasantarāya.	Eramanchi Timmappa Nāyaka's son Tulukāṇa Nāyaka provided a car for the Kamīśvara temple at Āragalūr.

(77) Śaka 1430, A.D. 1508.	Vibhava.	Proddutturu, 389 of 1904.	...	Records gift by Sāḷuva Gōvinda for the merit of (the king?) Vīra Narasimharāya, his father Rāchirāja and Sāḷuva Timmayya The donor built the prākāra wall and a maṇḍapa of the temple
(78) Śaka 1430, Śukla, Mīna śu. di. 7. Thursday Viśāka. A.D. 1509.		Āragal, Salem Dt., 427 of 1913.	Krishṇarāya with Śāḷuva titles.	Eramanchi Tulukāṇa Nāyaka built a car. etc.
(79) Śaka 1431, Pramōdha, Chaitra śu. di. 15. A.D. 1509.		Pānem, Nandyal Tq. 165 of 1913.	Krishṇadēva.	Grant of Būdhipāḍu to Phaṇikēśvara.
(80) Śaka 1431, (expired) Śukla. May 14, 1509(S).		Tāḍpatri (Tel.), 342 of 1892.	...	Mentions the minister Sāḷuva Timma.
(81) Śaka 1431, Śukla, kārtika, Oct. 14 — Nov. 13. A.D. 1509 (S).		Pulivenḍla, 491 of 1906.	Vīrapratāpa Krishṇarāya Mahārāya.	...
(82) Śaka 1432 (expired) Pramōdha. A.D. 1511.		Tiruppanangāḍu, 240 of 1906.	Krishṇadēva Mahārāya son of *Gaṇḍa kattāri Sāḷuva vana Vēṭṭai-kaṇḍaruḷiya Narasa Nāyaka Uḍaiyār.*	..

The Yet-remembered Ruler of a Long-forgotten Empire

KRISHNADEVARAYA OF VIJAYANAGAR.

A. D.—1509—A. D. 1530.

I

The Empire of Vijayanagar came into being under stress of circumstances which necessitated the gathering together of all the strength that the Hindu civilization was capable of putting forth in an effort to preserve that civilization from the utter destruction which had almost overtaken it in this part of India. 'That the south is now in many respects the most orthodox and the most conservative portion of the Continent' as observed by Professor Rapson, is in a very large measure due to the great national effort which culminated in the foundation of the Empire of Vijayanagar. Through all the two centuries and a half of unremitting resistance to the aggressive Moslem-power and constant warfare, the fact that the very existence of Hindu civilization was in jeopardy was never lost sight of. In the intervals of war, and even while the interminable wars were in progress in the northern frontier, a great deal was done by way of reconstruction of the civilization which had given way to the repeated blows of the Moslem hammer, laid on them through half a century of intermittent invasion and unsettlement. This effort at reconstruction was carried on

as a sacred trust, with a few exceptions perhaps, by the successive rulers of Vijayanagar, as also by the others whose function in society was to lead, be it in the realm of matter or of mind. This constructive effort reached its culmination in the reign of King Krishṇadēvarāya whose Empire has long been forgotten but whose memory has ever been green in the minds of the people as the South Indian analogue of the so far traditional Vikramāditya of Ujjain, and of the much less legendary Haroun-al-Rashid of Baghdad.

Krishṇadēva, the contemporary of Henry VIII of England and of the Emperor Charles V, succeeded as Emperor on the death of his elder brother Vīra Narasimha, some time between the 4th of May and October 14th to November 13th of the year A.D. 1509; but his *abhiṣēka* or coronation ceremony took place on the 23rd or the 24th of January, A.D. 1510, the date of the Hampi epigraph of this King which records the grants made to the temple on the occasion.* Of this record Rai Sahib Mr. H. Krishna Sastri has the following remarks in his valuable contribution in the Archaeologist's Annual Report for India of 1907-08:—"The eulogy of Krishṇarāya which is registered in this inscription shows that the record must have been actually drawn up some years after the coronation, by which time, at least, as will be shown in the sequel, *he had conquered the Gajapati King*, had extended his charities to the temples of *Venkaṭādri* (Tirumala), *Śoṇāchala* (*Tiruvaṇṇāmalai*), Kanaka-sabha (Chidambaram) and others, and had *earned the title a second Bhōja evidently after having composed, perhaps, the Telugu poem Āmuktamālyada*. Professor

*J. R. A. S. 1915, pp. 394–5.

Hultzsch, who has edited the inscription under reference, in the Epigraphia Indica, is doubtful if the date given in the Kanarese portion of the record is the actual date of the coronation or only its anniversary. We have seen above that Krishṇarāya's brother, Vīra Narasimha, was still ruling in the month of *Vaiśāka* of the Śaka year 1431,* (Śukla). A record from Pulivendla (Cuddapah),† dated in Śaka 1431 (Śukla), but in the month of Kārttika, states that Krishṇarāya was ruling on the throne at Vijayanagara. Consequently the date of the Hampi epigraph, though it may not exactly be the date of the coronation as already suspected by Professor Hultzsch, could not in any case be the anniversary of Krishṇarāya's *paṭṭābhiṣēka*. In all likelihood the King's coronation took place some time between the months of *Vaiśākha* and *Kārttika* in the cyclic year *Śukla* (corresponding to A.D. 1509–10), and the gifts made on that occasion were recorded on the Hampi stone after some interval.' It is quite possible that the epigraph was indited some time later as in the case of the epigraph in the underground temple, which, however, was a new structure on which epigraphs could be put in only on completion at least of the part which actually holds the epigragh. The actual record in question makes no specific reference either to the conquest of the Gajapati king or to the gifts to the temples as later records do. The reference to gifts to temples, contained in verse 24, is of the conventional kind. The reference to Gajapati is no more than 'who was like fever to the elephants of the Gajapati.' The comparison to Bhōja is contained in 'who (like) a second

* 342 of Epigraphist Collection for 1892.

† 491 of 1906.

Bhōja, knew the mysteries of poetry, of the drama and of rhetoric.' These are much too vague to bear the burden of the inferences drawn; that he conquered the Gajapati king, that he went round and made the specific grants to the temples, which he actually made later, and that he had actually written the *Āmuktamālyada* before the epigraph was indited are indeed facts. The main point, however, is that the ceremony of the coronation took place some months after the accession of Krishṇadēva. This is nothing unusual. 'The King is dead. Long live the King' is of universal application, in fact, though it may not find expression in all cases similarly. Krishṇa succeeded to the sovereignty immediately on the death of his brother and the ceremonial celebration came off later on for various possible reasons, among which the disturbed state of the Empire might have had dominant influence. Krishṇa then had his coronation (*paṭṭābhiṣēka*) on the 23rd or 24th January of the year A. D. 1510.

An explanation of the delay referred to above may perhaps be found in the following extract from Nuniz, although, from the nature of the case, any confirmation of the account can hardly be looked for in the other sources of information available to us at present. It must be noted however that the Telugu poem *Krishṇarājavijayamu*, of Kumāradurjati, who came, in all probability in the second generation after Krishṇadēva, states that Krishṇa was nominated by his father Narasa to succeed him and by implication that he actually did so succeed the father, notwithstanding the fact that several inscriptions do assert that he, in fact, succeeded his elder brother Vīra Narasimha. The

extract referred to is: 'This king (Busbal Rao or Vīra-Narasimha) died of his sickness in the city of Bisnaga; and before he died he sent for Salavatimya, his minister; and commanded to be brought to him his (the king's) son, eight years old, and said to Salavatimya that as soon as he was dead he must raise up this son to be the king (though he was not of an age for that, and though the kingdom ought perhaps to belong to his brother Krishnarao) and that he must put out the eyes of the latter and must bring them to show him ; in order that after his death there should be no difference in the kingdom. Salavatimya said that he would do so and despatched, and sent to call for Krishnarao, and took him aside to a stable, and told him how his brother had bade him put out his eyes and make his son king. When he heard this, Krishnarao said that he did not seek to be king, nor to be anything in the kingdom, even though it should come to him by right; that his desire was to pass through this world as a jogi (ascetic, recluse) and that he should not put his eyes out, seeing that he had not deserved that of his brother. Salavatimya, heeding this, and seeing that Krishnarao was a man over twenty years and therefore more fit to be king, as you will see farther on, than the son of Busbalrao, who was only eight years old, commanded to bring a she-goat, and he put out its eyes, took them to show the king, for already he was at the last hour of his life ; and he presented them to him, and as soon as the king was dead his brother Krishnarao was raised to be king, whose eyes the late king had ordered to be torn out.'

This account in all its circumstantial detail may be founded on fact or may not be ; but it is very likely that there was a difference of opinion in regard to the peaceful

supersession of the young son of Vīra Narasimha by the grown up uncle Krishṇa, and this may have actually caused the delay in the coronation. The supersession was a welcome change none the less, having regard to the condition of the Empire at the time, and the work that lay ahead to put it on a footing of permanent peace. Krishṇadēva was a great sovereign and has handed down to us memorials of his work in abundance; but we are left in the dark, all the same, in regard to the date of his birth. There are two verses in Telugu which give the dates Śaka 1387 and Śaka 1409. According to the one Krishṇa would have been about 45 years when he came to the throne; and according to the other 21 years. The latter seems nearer correct as Nuniz has it 'that Krishnarao was a man of over twenty years of age.' The more general, but also more personal, description given by Paes, would support the view that king Krishṇa came to the throne a young man rather than a mature man of forty-five years.

Śāḷuva Timma, the Brahman minister of both Narasa the father, and Vīra Narasimha, the elder brother of Krishṇa, sat at the helm of the administration and received such deferential treatment from the young monarch that he is known in popular tradition by the honorific "*appāji*" (respected father) while the monarch himself goes by the name Rāyar or Rāyaru or Rāyalu according as the tradition is Tamil, Kannaḍa or Telugu.

According to the chronicle of Nuniz the accession of Vīra Narasimha was the signal for a general revolt of the provinces of the Empire. Narasimha struggled hard during the short period of his rule and brought back most of these to

their allegiance. He had not the time, however, to bring the Empire to anything like a settled condition, and bequeathed it to his successors with a crop of trouble in the destruction of which a lesser genius than the united one of King Krishṇa and his minister Śāḷuva Timma would have succumbed. The occasion of these internal disturbances is the opportunity for the enemies of the Empire. There were the states of Bijapur in the north and the Gajapti of Kaḷinga in the east and north-east. The evolution of an administrative order out of the chaos of rebellion should have been the first to call for the monarch's attention. The subjugation of such of the rebels as had remained unsubdued would come in next. Last of all would come in the achievements of such ambitions as an Indian monarch is generally heir to: such as recovery of lost possessions or foreign conquest, pure and simple. Krishṇa's course in respect of the third is marked out for him by a predecessor of his, who came to the throne under circumstances even more discouraging than Krishṇa himself. That predecessor was Śāḷuva Narasimha I, the master of Krishṇa's father Narasa, whose labour fell short of his ambition in that Raichur, Koṇḍavīḍ and Udayagiri* remained in the possession of enemies, like three nails driven into the coffin of the Empire that he usurped to save. Krishṇa made the recovery of these fortresses his life-ambition and this gives the key to the understanding of the whole course of his reign.

Krishṇadēva began his reign, according to Nuniz, by despatching his young nephew and three brothers for internment at Chandragiri, remaining himself at headquarters

* R. Sewell's Forgotten Empire, p. 308 and p. 316.

for a year and a half 'without going outside of it, learning the affairs of the kingdom and looking at the testament of past kings.' Coming upon the testament of Śāḷuva Narasinga, that he left it to his successor to recover the three fortresses of Mudkal, Raichur and Udayagiri* Krishṇadēva prepared himself and started on his campaign against Udayagiri, continues the same authority. According to inscriptions of the time and contemporary or almost contemporary Telugu literature, Krishṇa had a great deal to do even by way of campaigning before launching upon this difficult enterprise of capturing Udayagiri. This account of the native authorities is confirmed in important particulars by the letter that Friar Luis † sent to Alphonso Albuquerque.

According to the *Rāyavāchakamu* and the *Krishṇarājavijayam*, Krishṇa turned his attention first of all to an examination of the civil and military resources of the empire. He found several of the provinces negligent both in their payments to the Imperial treasury and their contributions to the Imperial army. Krishṇa adopted a device for bringing about a peaceful settlement of both. He called in a number of the more powerful chieftains, perhaps they had arrived for the coronation ceremony as a long list of these is given as having attended, and, when they could hardly be prepared, ordered an investigation into the schedule of troops that the various chiefs ought to hold at the service of the headquarters, and the actual number then so held. The chiefs had to make good the number by

* R. S. Forgotten Empire, p. 316.

† Commentaries of Albuquerque, III, 35. Hakluyt Edn.

draughts from their own contingents and make the number square with the accounts. He is said to have made ready to hand an army of 24,000 caparisoned horse at an annual cost of one lakh of pagodas every thousand ; 10,000 elephants at 120,000 pagodas for every squad of ten, and 160,000 infantry at 24,000 pagodas for every division of a thousand.

It was also pointed out to him that in the country between the Krishna and the Kaveri many chieftains of hill forts owed him allegiance. This observation perhaps implied that they were none too ready to acknowledge their allegiance and act up to it. His first military operations seem to have been against this region. This passive hostility seems to have been aggravated by the active exertions of the chief of Ummattūr who showed himself ready to make capital out of the titles, which had been conferred upon him by Krishṇa's father Narasa (1)—" *Penugoṇḍa Chakrēśvara*' which might have carried with it the administration of the province of Penugoṇḍa, and (2) the '*Chikkarāyapaṭṭa*' which in his case should have been the dignity of a subordinate king rather than that of *Yuvarāja* as Rai Sahib Krishna Sastri seems inclined to take it to have meant. Krishṇa marched at the head of a small army of 5,000 foot and 2,000 horse, against one of his vassals who had risen up in rebellion and seized the city of Pergunḍa (Penugoṇḍa), (the rebel) declaring that to himself belonged the kingdom itself by right. The *Kongudēśarājākkaḷ* relates 'that after having first settled the Dravida country about Conjeevaram, Krishṇarāya crushed a refractory Rāja in the Mysore country, the Gangarāja of Ummatūr.' Thus what Fra-Luiz reported to Albuquerque finds ample confirmation in the native authorities of which the Krishṇarājavijayam

and Rāyavāchakamu agree in stating that after he had brought back to allegiance the Gangarāja of Ummattūr, Krishṇa marched to Seringapatam and thence to Sankula Naika of Ikkeri. He thence proceeded to the frontiers of Bijapur. He continued his progress along the frontiers of Ahmadnagar, Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa, placing garrisons in important places like Adoni, Mudkal and Raichur, 'this last act striking terror into the hearts of his enemies.' A part of this grand royal progress is what Fra-Luiz reported 'that directly he had taken the rebel, the king would proceed with all his force of men to his places situated on the edge of the sea.' This must have occupied the whole of the year A.D. 1511 and even extended into the next.* The circumstances attending the accession of Krishṇa to the throne and the disturbed state of the Empire would have called for such a demonstration of power, as Krishṇa exhibited by this progress. He had information from his spies in Bijapur which necessitated the strengthening of the frontier forts on the Muhammadan side and among them, it should be noted Raichur. "About the year 1512," writes Mr. Sewell, "Krishṇadēva Rāya, who had taken advantage of the times to invade the Sultan's dominions, attacked the fortress of Raichur which at last was given up to him by the garrison; Ismail Adil being too much employed in attending to the internal affairs of his government to afford it timely relief. So says Ferishta.† This

---

* Krishṇa was still in 'Sivanasamudra in Āngirasa (Śaka 1434), wherefrom he issued orders restoring some lands as *Brahmadēya* which order was announced at the *Laksha Hōma* going on at Penugoṇḍa at the time (180 of 1913, Epigraphist's Collection.)

† Scott's Trans. I. 236.

event is not noticed by Nuniz who writes as if the Rāya's first campaign against the Adil Shah took place in 1520, when he advanced to attack Raichur, it being then in the Shah's possession ; and here we see a difference between the story of Nuniz and the story of Ferishta, for the latter writing of the same event, *viz.*. the campaign of 1520, states that 'Ismail Adil Shah made preparations for marching to recover Mudkal and Raijore from the Roy of Beejanaggar,' he having taken these cities about 1512, as narrated. Which account is correct, I cannot say."

There need be no hesitation in saying that Ferishta is correct in this particular instance and the chronicle of Nuniz, invaluable as it is in matters relating to what took place in the capital at the period about which he was writing, is of no particular value, for what took place in the provinces of the Empire or in the Mussalman frontier in the north at a time rather removed from the period of Nuniz' stay. Nuniz has nothing to say of the rebellion of the Ummattūr chief as such, nor of the rebellion at Penugoṇḍa to both of which Fr. Luiz refers clearly. Fr. Luiz' account has, of course, the better authority for this period than that of either Nuniz or Paes ; and becomes a certainty as it is supported by the native accounts referred to above, and the Amarāvati inscription of Krishṇa dated 1515-16 (Śaka 1437) which speaks of Krishṇadēva as him, 'who, having taken by a forcible attack Sivanasamudra, Udyayādri, Vinukoṇḍa, Bellakoṇḍa, and, having captured alive on the battle-field Vīrabhadra the son of the Gajapati king, took Koṇḍavīḍu.'*

* Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VII, p. 18.

Nuniz cannot, however, be convicted of ignorance of this occurrence altogether. This point will come in for consideration further on in the course of the narrative of Krishṇadēva's doings.

This progress of Krishṇadēvarāya and his doings during the first two or even three years of his reign accounts for what seems unaccountable in respect of his attitude to the Portuguese. These applied to Krishṇa for an offensive and defensive alliance (1) against the Zamorin of Calicut and (2) against the Adil Shah of Bijapur.* In return for which Albuquerque offered the monopoly of trade in horses. The ambassador Fra-Luiz must have arrived in Vijayanagar soon after the accession of Krishṇa, possibly after the coronation in January 1510. Fr. Luiz' disappointment indicates that the overtures did not meet with an enthusiastic reception. It would be impossible to expect any other reception for such proposals at the time. Krishṇa was hardly settled upon the throne; the central region of his dominion showed signs of unrest; Gangarāja of Ummattūr was up in arms and laid claim to no less than the viceroyalty of Penugoṇḍa as his own. His organisation work had reached the ears of his Muhammadan neighbours who were busy preparing to repel an attack whenever it should be delivered. It would have been worse for Krishṇadēva and Vijayanagar, had not the attention of the Sultans of Ahmadnagar, Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa been fully occupied nearer home. He did the best in the circumstances, sent a return embassy with instructions not to commit themselves too far. When, however, he found

* Albuquerque's Commentaries, II, pp. 72-77, Hakluyt Edn.

himself in possession of Bankapur, and placed his garrisons in Mudkal, Raichur and Adoni, he could assume a more definite attitude in regard to coming to an understanding with the Portuguese whose possession of Goa then seemed assured. His attitude in respect of the co-operation sought against the Zamorin might have been influenced by the consideration that Calicut was a Hindu state, and the Portuguese were foreigners, though useful as traders.

The victorious progress of Krishṇadēvarāya through his dominions, particularly the putting in of garrisons in the forts along the Mussalman frontier did not go unchallenged. His Muhammadan neighbours are said to have crossed the river Krishna (probably) at the head of a lakh of horse. A battle was fought and the enemy beaten back. A proposal is said to have been made to take advantage of this defeat to invade the Muhammadan territories. Śāḷuva Timma set his face against the proposal as it was hardly prudent from the strategist's point of view, so long as the Gajapati remained in possession of the territories on the flank.

The veteran minister made it clear that the conquest of the territories in the possession of the Gajapati was a necessary preliminary to any effective action against Krishṇa's Muhammadan neighbours on the north.

Before proceeding to Krishṇadēva's wars against the Kalinga Gajapati, one point requires to be considered—namely, whether Nuniz has actually omitted all mention of the first campaign of Krishṇadēva. It looks as if he did omit mention altogether, as he makes Krishṇa's action depend upon the discovery of Śāḷuva Narasimha's testament.

The last required no discovery. Śāḷuva Timma was an old man when Krishṇa's father Narasa was yet alive. He must have had first-hand knowledge of Narasimha's wishes, and of Narasa's and Vīra Narasimha's efforts for the fulfilment of these. It was merely a question of biding the time. It is this mistaken view of this particular circumstance on the part of Nuniz which led him astray in chronicling the events of the early part of Krishṇa's reign. The first campaign of Krishṇa against the chief of Ummattūr is what seems to be referred to by Nuniz in the War against 'Catuir' which follows, in the chronicle, the war against the Gajapati of Kalinga.* As the passage has been altogether misunderstood so far, no apology is needed for considering it here at some length. 'After Krisnarao had made peace, and had married the daughter of the King of Oria, and had restored to him—his wife and the lands beyond the river, as has been narrated above, he made ready a large army and prepared to attack *Catuir, which is the land of a lord who had been in revolt for fifty years;* this land is on the Charamaodal side. And he went against it, laid siege *to one of the principal cities* where the lord of the land was; and it is called............, and is surrounded with water.' The following points require to be noted carefully.

(1) Catuir is the land of a lord, *i.e.*, a country not a city or town.

(2) This land is on the Chōḻamaṇḍala side, *i.e.*, in the direction of the Chōḻa country.

---

* Chap. vi, p. 320, Sewell's Forgotten Empire.

(3) That the lord of the land had been in revolt for fifty years.

(4) That the capital city, which Nuniz actually mentioned or obviously meant doing, is a blank. This makes it clear that Catuir was not the capital city.

In the following paragraph Nuniz states clearly that the city was surrounded by a river which then was in flood. The King cut channels to draw off the water and reached the walls of the city.* He took possession of the fortress with all its treasure of which he found a great quantity in money and specie.

This is exactly the description that is given of the siege and capture of Sivanasamudram in the Krishṇarājavijayamu. The damming up of a river for capturing a city protected by its waters is mentioned specifically in the taking of Seringapatam by Narasa in inscriptions. Sivanasamudram and its fall would first answer to the description of Nuniz in every detail. That was one of the capitals and the citadel of the Gangarāja of Ummattūr who was attacked and defeated by Krishṇa. This territory of Gangarāja is on the Chōḻamaṇḍala side of Vijayanagar; and the Rāja had been in revolt for some time, if not exactly fifty years. Sivanasamudram in all likelihood seems the city which baffled mention by Nuniz, as the place is left blank in the

* *Opus cit.* p. 321. 'Ummattūri' Sivanasamudra pura-vaprōnmūlanāḍambara.

You, who exhibited your great valour in pulling down the walls of Sivanasamudra, which belonged to Ummattūr.

(Telugu: *Pārijātāpaharaṇam* dedicated to Krishṇadēvarāya himself).

original. There are two details, however, which require to be satisfactorily accounted for before this identification can be regarded as sound. The first is what is Catuir? Then how is the wrong position of this incident in Nuniz' chronicle to be explained?

As there is little doubt that 'the land of Catuir' refers to a province rather than to a city it is clear we have to look for the equivalent of Catuir in the name of a province or a district. It seems open to little doubt that Catuir is Nuniz' modification of the Tamil *Kāḍavar*, a name ordinarily given to the Pallavas in Tamil literature, and which survives yet in the Kārvēṭinagar zamindari in the modern Chittoor District of the Madras Presidency. On the disruption of Chōḻa Empire in the thirteenth century it is a *Kāḍava* chieftain Kōpperunjinga who came in for the bigger share of the dismantled Empire. In the period immediately following there appear to have been a number of chieftains going by the name *Kāḍavas* 'in the Dravida country,' that is the region round about Conjivaram, some of whom figure in the wars of the Pāṇḍyas and the Hoyśalas. The Champarāya or Samparāya who was conquered by Kumara Kampa of Vijayanagar appears to have belonged to this dynasty and had for his capitals *Vṛinchipuram* (*Marakatanagara*) and Conjivaram. What is more his stronghold was called *Rājagambhīram*. The Sanskrit Kāvya *Madhuravijayam or Kamparāyacharitam*, celebrating Kumara Kampaṇa's conquest of Madura, actually calls the chieftains round Vṛinchipuram, not far from Velur on the Madras Southern Mahratta Railway, *Vanyarājas*, a translation of *Kāḍavas*. In Kampa's time this region belonged to the sphere of the Viceroyalty of Mulbagal (*Kanṭakānanapaṭṭaṇam*).

It is just possible that it changed to the Penugoṇḍa Viceroyalty in the period following. It is this name of the *Kāḍavas* that Nuniz called Catuir. Gangarāja laid claim to the Viceroyalty of Penugoṇḍa and in order the better to make good his claims by force of arms he might have set up the Kāḍava chieftains to rebel. This perhaps accounts for Samparāyas being found farther north, in the region of Karnul and Rajamundri governments later. This might have been brought about as an act of policy by Krishṇadēvarāya himself or some of his predecessors.

This equation of Catuir with the country of the Kāḍava chieftains (the *Vanyarājas* of the Kāvya already referred to) would answer to the description in every detail except that of time. Is there any way of explaining the discrepancy in Nuniz' chronicle which, from the nature of the work itself, has no claim to the degree of accuraey in detail which has too often been allowed to it? The prominence that Nuniz has given to the testament of Śāḷuva Narasinga in shaping the policy of Krishṇa has led to this misplacing of the enterprise against Catuir. Nuniz' account would make one believe that Krishṇa was awakened to a new responsibility by the discovery of the testament and proceeded with all expedition to the fulfilment of his predecessor's wishes. It may be that his informant was really responsible. It seems more likely, however, that Nuniz himself made the mistake in putting together his notes, made from time to time, in a connected form for the information of the dignitary in Lisbon. It must have appeared the natural course to him that Krishṇa should have gone against Orissa, the first affair of all. As a matter of fact the operations against Sivanasamudram, the garrisoning of the fortresses on the

Krishna frontier and the eastward march against the territory in the occupations of the Orissa king, all these form one continuous course of Krishṇa's early military activity. The war against the Muhammadans would have brought on the war against the Gajapati as well but for the intervention in the council, of Śāḷuva Timma, the minister-in-chief. It looks very probable that Nuniz committed this error at the time that he put the narrative in the form in which it has come down to us, and the more so, that he appears to have forgotten to note the name of the town which was taken by Krishṇadēva. Chapter vi. of Nuniz will have to be read immediately after the first paragraph of Chapter v. This conclusion finds strength in the *Kongudēśarājākkaḷ*, a Tamil chronicle of the seventeenth century, which records that Krishṇa had first of all to put down some disturbances in the Dravida country round Conjivaram and then proceed against a powerful chief in Mysore, the Gangarāja of Ummattūr.*

In respect of this chapter of Nuniz, Mr. Sewell goes no farther† than suggesting Vellore as the place actually meant by Nuniz. Rai Sahib Mr. Krishna Sastri, however, lays himself out elaborately to prove that Catuir is Katak, the capital of Orissa‡ In order to establish this thesis of his he neglects to account for the details in connection with the event as set forth in Nuniz, and takes Krishṇadēva in victorious career on a second invasion of Orissa, Nuniz' statement to the contrary, that he never went again that side, notwithstanding. It would be strange, indeed,

* Vide Epigraphia Indica, Vol. vii, p. 18.

† Sewell's Lists of Antiquities II, p. 239.

‡ A. S. R. 1908-9, p. 180.

if the Telugu poem which describes, in such elaborate detail, the first war against Kalinga should have omitted all reference to the next invasion, which in itself is very highly improbable after the marriage and the definitive treaty which followed it. No elaborate theory in defiance of all historical criticism is called for, seeing that the error ascribed to Nuniz in this particular instance is no more grave than the error of which he stands indubitably convicted in respect of the Kalinga prince Vīrabhadra's imprisonment in Vijayanagar, and his death as a prisoner, a statement which rests on the authority of both Nuniz and Paes. In regard to this incident, Mr. Krishna Sastri himself states 'This does not appear to have been the case; for, a record from the Davanigere Taluka of the Chitaldroog District (Epigraphia Carnataca Vol. IX, Dg. 107) states that Vīrabhadra Mahārāya, son of the Gajapati King, Pratāparudra Mahārāya, was ruling under the orders of Krishṇarāya, the district of Malega-Bennur *sīme* and remitted, in that capacity, the tax on marriages in Śaka 1438, Yuvan (A.D. 1515—16), for the merit of his father Pratāparudra and king Krishṇarāya. This interesting record testifies to the high statesmanship of Krishṇarāya who, far from ill-treating a captive prince, raised him to the dignity of a provincial chief which he originally was when he held Koṇḍaviḍu (as a feudatory of his father).

Thus then it becomes clear that as soon as Krishṇa felt his footing firm enough at headquarters he left on his campaign against the Kāḍava chiefs of the middle region right up to Conjivaram, proceeded thence against the chief of Ummattūr, took the fortress of Sivanasamudram by storm and proceeded to Serinagapatam, the headquarters of the

Vijayanagar Viceroyalty. Leaving thence he went to Ikkeri, probably the headquarters of Sankula Nāyaka, and then towards the Bijapur frontier. Turning East he placed garrisons in Mudkal, Raichur and Adoni. Therefrom he returned to headquarters to prepare himself for the war against the Gajapati on the East Coast.

II.

This war against Kalinga falls into three episodes ; the siege and capture of Udayagiri ; the capture of Koṇḍavīḍ and a few of the surrounding forts ; and the march upon Kalinga itself conquering the two Telinganas—the Telingana part of the modern Nizam's Dominions partly under the Muhammadans, and the Telingana of the coast under the Gajapati of Kalinga. These form three separate campaigns and together constitute Krishṇadēvarāya's Kalinga war, the object of which was clearly to undo the work of mischief which had been allowed to be wrought upon the Empire in the days of its ineptitude under the last rulers of the first dynasty. This undoing was the ambition of the high-minded usurper Sāḷuva Narasiṁha which his equally high-minded successor Krishṇa had lived to accomplish. It was already stated that Śāḷuva Timma pointedly drew the attention af the king to the danger of undertaking any larger enterprise against the Muhammadans on the Golkoṇḍa frontier, with the flank open to attack either from Koṇḍavīḍ and its neighbouring fortresses on the one side or straight from Udayagiri on the other.

Returning home from the campaign on the Golkoṇḍa frontier in A.D. 1512 Krishṇa formed his plans and marched upon Udayagiri.

The latter half of Canto III of the *Krishṇarājavijayamu* from stanza 53 to the end, deals with this campaign and this work is confirmed in every detail by the *Rāyavāchakamu.* According to these the order of events is as follows :—Krishṇa marched upon Udayagiri and took it after a siege. Therefrom he went to Kandukūr and thence to Koṇḍavīḍu. The *Rāyavāchakamu*, however, has it that he beat off the Massalman troops across the Krishna, and then attacked Hurmatti. From there he marched upon Kondūr, from which again he proceeded to Koṇḍavīḍ which surrendered on hearing that the other forts round about such as Koṇḍappalli, Bellamkoṇḍa, Vinukoṇḍa, Nagarajunikoṇḍa and the territories belonging to them were plundered, the inhabitants finding shelter in the nearest forts. Then Krishṇa placed these forts under his own commanders at the head of a sufficient force in each against attacks, chief among these

> Koṇḍavīḍu under Koṇḍayya,
> Vinukoṇḍa under Bhāskarayya,
> Bellamkoṇḍa under Vīrabhadra, and
> Nagarajunikoṇḍa under Ayyalaiya.

Both these agree in making Krishṇa march upon Ahmadnagar by which they appear to mean Ahmadabad Bider, the headquarters of the Bahmani Sultan, the *roi faineant* at the time. Having destroyed the fort which was evacuated and sowing castor seeds and the seeds of calatropia gigantia, Krishṇa set forward upon his march to distant Kalinga. He found the passes, however, held in force by the enemy ; and overruling Śāḷuva Timma's advice of caution, he turned the passes throwing into confusion

Jitaph Khan's 60,000 archers and entered Telingana of the coast belonging to Kalinga. He marched on from one place of importance to another meeting with little opposition in the way till he arrived at Simhādri on the frontiers of the Kalinga kingdom proper where he ordered his camp to be erected.

As all the garrisons that the Gajapati had placed in the various fortresses extending right down to Udayagiri had either been destroyed or beaten in, the Gajapati held a Council of War with his 'Round Table' of the sixteen Mahāpatras. Śāḷuva Timma had recourse to a device to undermine the loyalty of the Mahāpatras and make them appear traitor in the estimation of their sovereign. He wrote letters, purporting to be in fulfilment of a previous agreement, detailing the jewels, money and other corresponding presents intended for the Mahāpatras for the service they had presumably undertaken to render Krishṇa by betraying their sovereign. He contrived that the letter itself and some of the presents should fall into the hands of the Gajapati. As a result of this ruse the Gajapati lost faith in his knights and fled for safety from his capital. Having annihilated opposition in this manner peacefully Krishṇadēva entered the town of Simhādri. He then isssued orders that the army should proceed no further than that town towards the capital of the Gajapati. 'I have fulfilled my vow; let the Gajapati rule his kingdom' said Krishṇa and opened negotiations for peace. The Gajapati came with presents feeling that his alliance was sought. The negotiations ended in the marriage of King Krishṇa with the Kalinga princess Tukka, as she is called and the conclusion of a definitive treaty between the

Gajapati of Kalinga and the *Narapati* of Vijayanagar by which the former ceded to the latter all the territory south of the Krishna, that is, that part which was taken from Vijayanagar by the predecessors of Prātaparudra Gajapati. This done, Krishṇa proceeded to Tirupati with his two queens *Tirumalādēvi* and *Chinnādēvi* who accompanied him in this war. Having heard that the chiefs of Kulbharga spoke lightly of him, he marched to the place. Having taken it, he placed a garrison in it under Gujjali Kalyāṇa Rao. He returned to Tirupati and had copper images of himself and his two queens, set up in the temple.* He is then said to have visited Kāḷahasti in the cyclic year Śrī-mukha by the *Rāyavāchakamu* which is obviously too early, if this visit took place after the war against the Gajapati.

Returning to Nuniz' account, it was already pointed out that he begins Krishṇarāya's reign with this war and that there is an error in this order of his narrative. There are other details which seem to be equally wrong. The first campaign in this war is against Udayagiri. The fort was taken by assault and not by starvation, after a siege lasting one year and a half. Among the prisoners were an aunt of the King of Orissa who was treated 'with all the courtesy he could show her, having her liberty; and he took her along with himself." His next move was against Koṇḍavīḍ. He laid siege to it. The King of Orissa marched to its relief at the head of 1,300 elephants, 20,000 horses and 500,000 men. Krishṇa moved out from before the walls of Koṇḍavīḍ and came up with the enemy, four leagues from the fortress, 'a river of salt water' separating

* A. S. R. 1910-11, plate xxvi, facing p. 188.

them. Having defeated the King of Orissa here in battle, he returned to the fortress which surrendered after a further siege of two months. Crossing the river once more he marched into the Telingana of the coast as far as Koṇḍapalli 'where were all the chiefs of the kingdom, it being the chief city in the Kingdom.' He took it after a siege of three months. Among the prisoners he took were one of the queens of Orissa, one of the princes and seven 'principal captains.' Sending these off to Vijayanagar, Krishṇa marched without opposition to Rajamandri and there halted six months without the King of Orissa making any effort to oppose his progress. 'He sent many messages to say that he was waiting for him in the field, but he never came.' And in this city he did many works, and gave alms to the temples, and erected therein a very grand temple to which he gave much revenue. And he commanded to engrave on it an inscription which says:—"Perhaps when these letters are decayed, the King of Orya will give battle to the King of Bisnagar. If the King of Orya erases them, his wife shall be given to the smiths who shoe the horses of the King of Bisnagar." * This done, Nuniz brings back Krishṇa to Vijayanagar. It was during his stay at headquarters that he called upon the Orissa prince, then prisoner, to exhibit his skill in fencing by meeting a professional fencer of the Court. The prince, rather than submit to this indignity committed suicide. When information of this tragic end of his son reached the King of Orissa he sued for peace offering the hand of his daughter at the suggestion of Śāḷuva Timma. The marriage was agreed to and Krishṇa restored the lands on the

* Sewell's Forgotten Empire, p. 319.

further side of the river retaining those on this side. It is after this, according to Nuniz that Krishṇa undertook his invasion of 'the land of Catuir.'

Koṇḍavīḍ fell, according to the Koṇḍavīḍ and Mangaḷagiri records, on a day equivalent to the 23rd June, 1515. At least eight months after this date Prince Vīrabhadra, the son of the Gajapati, lived to make a grant, as Krishṇa's governor of Malaga-Bennur *śīme* for the merit of his father Pratāparudra Gajapati and king Krishṇarāya. It is hardly likely that he was called back from his government to exhibit his skill in swordsmanship in the grossly insulting fashion in which it is reported to have been done by the Portuguese chronicler. Krishṇarāya seems to have adopted a very much more far-sighted policy in regard to his neighbour, the Gajapati, and carried his war against him only so far as to make a permanent treaty of peace possible. Nor is there any reason to believe that he returned from the Kalinga war from Rajamandri to wreak his impotent vengeance upon a helpless prisoner. In the circumstances, the inscription said to have been recorded at Rajamandri might be rejected as a figment of the imagination, as no such record seems to have come to light among more than 300 inscriptions relating to this monarch. The chronicler does not even refer to the further march of Krishṇadēva up to Simhāchallam, nor of the erection of a pillar of victory there. Nuniz' acccount therefore, of the Kalinga wars of Krishṇa, is inadequate in respect of the main episodes, and inaccuarate in regard even to its general trend.

Fortunately for students of history, there are enough left of Krishṇadēva's records, monumental and epigraphic,

to give a far fuller and a very much more accurate narrative of his wars, and it is very gratifying to find these confirming almost completely the account derivable from literature. Almost the earliest record bearing upon the wars of Krishṇa is one dated the Śaka year Āngīrasa.* The number of the year and other details are gone, but it is clear the year Āngīrasa is the fourth year of his reign and would correspond to A.D. 1512-13. On the date of this record the Emperor was in Sivanasamudra; and ordered from there the restoration of certain lands as *Brahmadēya* (free gift to Brahmans). This order was announced at the *Lakṣa-Hōma* ceremony which was then going on in Penukoṇḍa. Śāḷuva Gōvinda, the brother of Śāḷuva Timma was put in charge of this district after its conquest and there are a number of grants he issued from Śaka 1435 onwards.† Five Epigraphs two at Krishṇāpuram near Hampi and three from Tirumalē (Tirupati) dated Bhava, the Śaka year 1436 refer to this year as the date of his return from the conquest of Udayagiri. The war against Udayagiri then took place between the years Śaka 1434 and 1436. In other words he was engaged in this war during the years A.D. 1513 and 1514. The trilingual record, referred to above gives a graphic description of how Krishṇadēvarāya 'started on a military expedition against Pratāparudra Gajapati crushed and pierced (*i.e.*, drove) him as far as Koṇḍavīḍu, took possession of the fortress of Udayagiri, and on his way back to the capital Vijayanagara went up to the top of Tirumalai hill, paid homage to the lord *Vēnkaṭanātha*, had him bathed in gold (*kanakābhiṣēka*)

* 180 of 1913, Epigraphist's Collection.

† Epigraphia Carnataka, Mysore, Part I, Nj. 195.

with 30,000 gold pieces (*varāhans*) and presented a triple-stringed necklace and a pair of gold bangles of very high value set with pearls, diamonds, rubies, and topaz.* The other two records, those of Hampi, state that the king having taken the fortress of Udayagiri, brought from there the image of Bālakrishṇa, which he set up in a jewelled *maṇṭapa* in the Krishṇaswāmi temple, on the third Friday of the last month of Śaka 1436, (about March 1514). There are a large number of other epigraphs which begin an account of his conquests in the East with the capture of Udayagiri and close the account with his setting up a pillar of victory at *Simādhri-Poṭṭunūra* (Simhāchallam) in the Vizagapatam district. There are inscriptions on the hill at Udayagiri, which confirm others relating to the affair, stating that among the prisoners taken was an uncle of the Gajapati whose name is given variously as Tirumala-Rāghavarāya or Tirumala-Kantarāya or Tirumala-Rāhutta-rāya.†

It becomes thus clear that Krishṇa came to the throne in the latter half of A.D. 1509 ; moved towards the central portion of the Empire about the end of A.D. 1510, was at Sivanasamudra in 1512 and was on the Bijapur frontier about the end of the same year according to Ferishta, having taken possession of Mudkal and Raichore. He then started on his campaign against Udayagiri, returning successfully from it in the year A.D. 1514.

The next campaign of this war against the Gajapati was the invasion which began with the operations round

* A.S.R. 1908–9, p. 176, also Epigraphist's Report, Madras, 1889, para 2.

† U. 37, 38, 40 and 41, Nellore Inscription.

Koṇḍavīḍu. Krishṇa appears to have left the capital in the beginning of the year A.D. 1515 and laid siege to the strong fort of Koṇḍavīḍu. This attack upon one of the most important frontier fortresses seems to have brought on him a combined attack by the Kuṭub Shah and the Gajapati of Kalinga. Krishṇa successfully repelled this attack and took the fortresses on his side of the Krishna such as Addanki, Vinukoṇḍa, Bellamkoṇḍa, Nagarajunikoṇḍa, Tangeda, Ketavaram and other strongholds in the possession of the enemy. Then he carried the fortresses of Koṇḍavīḍu by storm, taking prisoner Prince Vīrabhadra and a nobleman by name, Kasavapatra. Koṇḍavīḍu fell as was already stated on a date corresponding to 23rd June, A.D. 1515. Then he entered the Kuṭub Shah's territories and went on taking fort after fort till he reached Kambammettu. From the Tiruvaṇṇāmalai, Kāḷahasti and the Amarāvati inscriptions it may have to be inferred that Krishṇarāya on this occasion captured alive Vīrabhadrarāya or Vīrabhadrasēna, the son of Pratāparudra, Naraharipatra the son of Kumāra-Hammira-Mahāpatra (perhaps also a Gajapati prince), Mullukhan and Uddandakhan of Rachūru (Raichore), *Rāchirāju* of *Pūsapāḍu*, *Śrīnātharāju* and *Lakshmīpati-rāju*, Kasavapatra of Janyala, Bālachandra Mahāpatra of the West and other nobles and feudatory chiefs.* That such a large number of chiefs should have been brought together at Koṇḍavīḍu is a very clear indication of the importance attached to the possession of Koṇḍavīḍu as the key to the south. The presence of the two Muhammadan chiefs indicate the co-operation of the Mussalman Government of Haidarabad-Telingana. This is all the Muhammadan

* A.S.R. 1908–9, p. 178.

activity noticeable on this side. The Kuṭub Shah seems to have been too much occupied nearer the Bahmani head-quarters to take any greater part in these wars. The campaigns of Kuṭub Shah * described so elaborately in the account by an unnamed author seem to refer to a period much later than this as none of the incidents seem capable of being equated with the incidents in these wars of Krishṇa. The same year A. D. 1515, the king with his two queens Tirumalādēvi and Chinnādēvi visited the temple of Amarēśvara at Dharaṇikota, and there made the munificent gifts of *tulāpuruṣa*, *ratnadhēnu* and *saptasāgara* and presented some villages.† From here he appears to have visited both Śrī Śailam and Ahōbalam in 1516 before proceeding upon his war against the Gajapati in Telingana of the Coast. This was perhaps while Śāḷuva Timma was occupied in placing the conquered districts under suitable government, civil and military.‡

He then set forward. Encamping the army at Bezwada he laid siege to Koṇḍapalli. This fort fell in time and among the prisoners taken were Praharāju Śiraschandra-Mahāpatra, (Bo)dajamma-Mahāpatra and *Bijilikhan*. From Koṇḍapalli Krishṇa marched north taking along the way various fortresses, 'Anantagiri, Undrakoṇḍa, Uralagoṇḍa, Aruvapalli, Jallepalli, Kandikoṇḍa, Kappulavayi, Nalgoṇḍa, Kambamettu, Kanakagiri, Śankaragiri and other fortresses.' He marched up to *Simhādri-Poṭṭunūra* and, having encamped there, made to the temples, in the company of

* Brigg's Ferishta, Vol. iii, pp. 355–378. *Vide* Sewell's List of Antiquities, Madras, Vol. I, 50.

† Nos. 266 and 272 of 1897, Madras, Epigraphist's Collection.

‡ Madras Epigraphist's Collection Nos. 18 and 64 of 1915.

both his queens, large benefactions.* Coming to the end of the campaign there and having entered into a treaty with the Gajapati he set up a pillar of victory and returned. He was on the banks of the Krishna on the return journey in Śaka 1438 (about July-August, 1516.)†

There is no inscriptional record so far known of his having gone north of the Krishna except the Simhāchallam inscriptions of Śaka 1441 (A.D. 1519). These refer to grants made by Krishṇarāya, it may be from Vijayanagar or any other part of his Empire. Both the *Rāyavāchakamu* and the *Krishṇarāvijayamu* bring his campaign to end with this, and state that he then went on a pilgrimage to the holy places in South India. This seems the natural termination of his war against the Gajapati, the object of which was to bring the Gajapati to enter into a definitive treaty and thus be rid of any anxiety on that side of his frontier. He had no further object of ambition as against the Gajapati ; what he did wish to do he had done in the most suitable manner for assuring permanency to the arrangements they had come to.

This historically simple settlement has, however, been complicated by a couple of verses from Peddanna's *Manucharitē* ‡ which in high poetical language describe Krishṇa's valour as a fire set aflame by the conquest of Udayagiri. This goes on increasing till it had grown up to

* Madras, Epigraphist's Collection 243 and 245 of 1899.

† Epigraphia Carnataka. Hassan Vol.; Hassan 13.—The details of the date are *Dhātri Āshāḍa-bahuḷa, Amāvāsya, Karkātaka Sankrānti*.

‡ Rao Bahadur Viresalingam Pantulu's *Lives of the Telugu Poets*, p. 15.

a conflagration at *Poṭṭunūra* and reduced *Oḍḍādi* to ashes. The heat of this great comet-fire made Katak too hot for the Gajapati to remain any longer there, and drove him to find shelter from it in the caves of the Vindhyas. This merely poetical statement, beautiful as poetry and as close to facts as poetry can be to history, has been laid hold of by Rai Sahib H. Krishna Sastri to warrant another invasion of Orissa, or at least a continuation of the one which actually terminated at Simhādri-Pottunūra on the farther frontiers of the Vizagapatam district. It is the false equation of Nuniz' Catuir with Katak, which is primarily responsible for this. It is hardly necessary to restate the case against this equation. On general considerations it seems extremely unlikely. The ruler who could appreciate the prudence of not advancing into the Nizam's Dominions leaving Nellore and Guntur in the occupation of an enemy is not the man to move northwards indefinitely. He had gone about past the limits of prudence when he reached Simhāchallam. It was necessary, however, to come to a definite treaty with the Gajapati which he successfully canvassed by other ways than war. Setting fire to her father's capital is by no means the best way of wooing the Gajapati's daughter--the almost contemporary achievement of Protector Somerset providing an apt illustration.

Krishṇa's second war was thus against the Gajapati and had for its object permanent peace on the eastern and north-eastern frontier. By three separate campaigns this object was achieved. The first campaign was against Udayagiri; the next against Koṇḍavīḍu; and the last a general conquest of the Telingana of the coast to bring the Gajapati to terms. Krishṇa succeeded in achieving his

object to the utmost of his aspiration. He could now feel the satisfaction that he had achieved what even his great predecessor Śāḷuva Narasimha was not able to accomplish. The Empire of Vijayanagar was brought to the state in which it was in the days of the great Dēvarāya II. The fortresses of Raichore, Koṇḍavīḍu and Udayagiri were brought back into the Empire with the dependent territories. He could now turn his attention to paying those tributes of devotion to the great temples of the south, the restoration and elaboration of which had become his heritage as the successor of the far-seeing founders of the Empire whose self-imposed mission it was to recover for Hinduism all that it could have in the south. The years 1516 to 1520 are years of benefactions to temples and attention to the administrative needs of a well-ordered Empire such as Krishṇa's was at the time.

While still the war against the Gajapati was in progress, he paid repeated visits to the temples of Tirupati and Kāḷahasti of which he had somehow come to regard the former as the shrine of his patron-god. It was already stated that he set up in that temple copper casts of himself and his two queens. He carried out large works to restore and enhance the magnificence of the Śaiva shrine in the neighbourhood at Kāḷahasti. After the war was over he is found travelling in the regions of the Udayagirirājyam repairing damages and making additions to the temples at Śrī Śailam and Ahōbalam. Then came in its turn the great Śiva temple at Tiruvaṇṇāmalai. He then extended his benefactions to all the great south Indian temples in a general order which he issued from his camp on the banks of the Krishna making over the Imperial revenues in

various localities to the total of 10,000 pagodas. It is just about this time he undertook large building works at head-quarters some of the big temples having been entirely built by him and others receiving vast additions. He also caused all the bigger temples of Southern India being provided with the great outer *gōpuram*, such as one sees even in neglected and out of the way temples as those at Uttara-kośamangai and Mahābalipuram. These magnificent entrances, the complete and the incomplete alike, are named Rāya-gōpuram even now. This large scheme of works must have been years in the execution, and the fact that several of them remain incomplete would prove that the destruction of the Empire came sooner than the time required for their completion.

This was but one of his many building activities. He built the small town of Hospet early in his reign in memory of his mother Nāgalādēvi. He constructed a large tank for purposes of irrigation and water supply to the imperial capital. His Viceroys and Governors took the cue from him, and there are records of Rāyasam Koṇḍamarasa having constructed two at least of the larger irrigation tanks in the Nellore district, the *Kāluvāyi* tank and the *Anantasāgaram*. The fact that he projected such large schemes for works of public utility would indicate that he felt the Empire had reached a state of permanent peace, which indeed was broken only once in the campaign against the Adil Shah for the possession of that debatable land, the Raichur Doab. We shall revert to this campaign before proceeding further with the achievements of this sovereign in peace.

II.

Readers of the two Portuguese chronicles, which form the appendices to the Forgotten Empire of Vijayanagar of Mr. Sewell, can hardly resist the feeling that the campaign against Raichur is the third act of a great tragedy and that all the events preceding merely lead up to this; while those that follow flow from the great event as of necessary sequence. So it looks from the narrative of Paes and Nuniz, particularly the latter. But Indian literature and even the inscriptions of Krishṇadēva give no hint that any such importance was attached to this now famous battle of Raichur, great as it was from the military point of view and important in the consequences that ultimately flowed from it. This looks anamolous in the extreme, and the apparent anamoly has to be explained before proceeding to the actual description of the war that ended in the fall of Raichur. It was already made clear that the war against the Gajapati had for its object nothing less than permanent peace on that frontier and that that was secured. Krishṇa felt he had done enough against the Gajapati to impress him with the conviction that the terms of the treaty must be respected. He further felt justified in assuring the title "Gajapati *Saptāṅgaharaṇa*" * 'he who deprived the Gajapati of *the seven features of royalty*' meaning thereby that he took possession of all that went to make a king. These seven features according to the *Nītiśāstras*, are, the king, the ministers, the army, the fortresses, the subjects, wealth, and friends—not necessarily literally, but in the general sense of a thorough surrender at discretion.

---

* A. S. R. 1908-9, p. 179, note 7.

It deserves to be noted in this connection that Krishṇa built the House of Victory, as it is called even in its ruins, to celebrate his conquest of the Gajapati. 'This house is called House of Victory,' says Paes, 'as it was made when the king came back from the war against Orya, as I have already told you,' (p. 263, Sewell's Forgotten Empire). The assumption of a title like that in a way indicates the esteem in which this enemy and his fighting power were held by Krishṇa and his admirers. On the other hand there is no epigraphic mention of the battle of Raichur except the solitary record in Tirukkadaiyūr where a Brahman named Āpatsahāya who carried out some repairs to the Śiva temple there states that he took part in the battle of Raichur. Nor are there references in literature which would warrant the inference that any great importance was attached to it. While it is quite likely that several of these works were written before the date of the battle there is perhaps no doubt that *Krishṇa-rājavijayamu* was written after. One inference from the silence would be that this particular event was not regarded as of the degree of importance to justify prominent mention. In other words if it was regarded as of no more importance than the fall of Bankapūr or its recapture, it would share the same fate. That seems the view taken by contemporaries in the country, and there is no reason to regard the event of any greater importance simply because Nuniz has left us a full and graphic description of the war. This view finds some explanation in the statement of Paes contained in the following extract which makes it clear that the sending out of large expeditions was nothing unusual, though the scale of the army

and equipment impressed the Portuguese with the idea of unusual magnifience.* 'I saw', says he, 'being in this city of Bisnagar, the King despatch a force against a place, one of those which he has by the sea coast; and he sent fifty captains with 150,000 soldiers, amongst whom were many cavalry. He has many elephants, and when the *king wishes to show the strength of his power to any of his adversaries amongst the three kings bordering on his kingdom, they say that he puts into the field two million soldiers; in consequence of which he is the most feared king of any in these parts.*'

It is such a demonstration in force that he made at the beginning of his reign when, taking advantage of the disturbed state of affairs in Bijapur and Bider, he threw in his own garrisons at Mudkal and Raichur. It is just possible that he made similar demonstrations of power again. The earlier expedition that Paes refers to is perhaps one of those against the Gajapati. Hence it seems clear that Krishṇa's battle of Raichur was a successful beating back of an invasion from Bijapur to recover possession of it, as Ferishta has it, though it is quite possible that in the course of the campaign they succeeded at first in occupying the fortress, as Nuniz' account makes it clear that Krishṇa had to lay siege to Raichur. To determine which of these two accounts has the greater claim to our credence it is necessary to understand the state of affairs in the Dakhan during the first decade of Krishṇa's reign.

The death of Mahommad Gawan put an end practically to the influence of the Bahmani kingdom

* Sewell's Forgotten Empire, pp. 279–80.

as a whole in the politics of the Dakhan. The reign of Mahomad Shah Bahmani II (1482—1517) was almost from the very beginning a nominal one. The form of a united monarchy was preserved till about the end of the century, with more or less of reality according to the shiftings of power among the feudatories of the first rank. In 1504, however, the man behind the throne, Kasim Barid, died leaving the precarious position to his son Amir Barid. The son began with tightening his hold upon the royal power. This change at headquarters was taken advantage of by Yusuf Adil Shah of Bijapur, perhaps the most enterprising among the five feudatories, who attacked the fief of Gulbarga which he had long wished to annex to his own viceroyalty or royalty. His effort succeeded, Dastur Dinar, the Governor, fell in the fight, and Gulbarga was annexed by Adil Shah. It was then that he committed the imprudence of introducing the Shia persuasion as the religion of the State. This caused an effort at a recombination of the other chiefs mainly through the exertions of Amir Barid who made use of the phantom-king for the purpose. Kuṭub Shah of Golkoṇḍa and Ahmad Nizam Shah of Ahmadnagar co-operated with Amir Barid, Imad-ul-Mulk of Berar with Kodawand Khan of Purendah keeping aloof. Yusuf Adil had to flee the kingdom and find asylum in Berar; Imad Shah's good offices in behalf of Yusuf failing through the machinations of Amir Barid, he took up arms in favour of his friend Yusuf Khan, as the destruction of the latter would mean the enhancement of the prestige of Amir Barid. This last made an attack on Bijapur on the death of Yusuf, and failed to take the place. In 1512, Kuṭub Shah of Golkoṇḍa declared himself independent, ostensibly independent of

Amir Barid, while professing an inclination to recognise the suzerain in Mahmud Shah. The energies of Kuṭub during the early years of his kingship were fully occupied in counteracting the machinations of Amir Barid on the one side and consolidating his immediate territories on the other. It was very soon after this that Amir Barid at the head of an army took Gulbarga and put in charge of it Jehangir Khan, son of Dustur Dinar, with the title Dustur-ul-Mulk. This latter improved his position soon after by acquiring all the territory which belonged to his father. It was in the midst of these transactions obviously that Krishṇa took occasion to intervene either on the side of the Adil Shah or on that of Amir Barid ; for after defeating the Barid Shah's troops on the outskrits of Bijapur, Ismail Adil Shah was able to accompany Mahmud Shah to Gulbarga and celebrate his sister's nuptials with Prince Ahmad Bahmani there. The remaining years of the life of this Sultan of the Bahmani dynasty was spent in oscillating between this chieftain and that while all of them alike were espousing the cause of one side or the other between Amir Barid and Ismail Adil. It is thus clear that the nearest Sultan, the Adil Shah of Bijapur was entirely occupied in keeping the ambition of Amir Barid within bounds on the one side and extending his territory on the Konkan coast and into the Nizam Shah's territories on the other. The Kuṭub Shah was marking time all the while, thowing in his lot now on this side, now on that, and making sure of his position in the immediate vicinity of his province. It is impossible, in such a state of domestic politics and international complications nearer home, that either of these two States pursued an active policy either of aggression or even of checking aggression.

It thus seems quite possible that Krishṇa's hold upon Mudkal and Raichur had remained firm for seventeen years, as Ferishta says,* when after the death of Krishṇa and in the confusion that followed, these were recaptured after a siege of three months. It seems just as likely that Krishṇa intervened on another occasion on this side, after his wars against the Gajapati had been brought to a close. While at Tirupati, he is said to have made a successful raid on Gulbarga, according to the *Rāyavāchakamu*. This is what obviously is referred to in his own poem *Āmukta-mālyada*, where he is said to have made a successful attack on Gulbarga and Sagare (which latter queerly enough is interpreted as the city of Sagara, Ayōdhya, by the commentator, instead of Nasratabad-Sagar not far from the river Bhima). There seems then some evidence to support the statement of Ferishta, and *ipso facto*, to discredit that of Nuniz in this particular. It seems very unlikely that King Krishṇa would have laid himself out for an elaborate scheme of temple-building and other works of public utility, if he did not feel that he had done enough by way of war to ensure permanent peace. Nor is there the slightest positive evidence that he himself made so much of the campaign against Raichur, as he did of his Kalinga invasion. It seems possible that Nuniz had put two separate events together in one transaction, and that Raichur passed into the hands of the Adil Shah in the course of the war for which there is no warrant either in what Ferishta has to say,† or anything clear in the chronicle of Nuniz.

* Ferishta : Briggs, Vol. III, p. 60.

† Ferishta : Briggs, III, 48-51.

Nuniz' account of the battle of Raichur therefore, deserves to be analysed and examined carefully. After Śāḷuva Timma returned from Koṇḍavīḍ where he had gone to put the government of the newly formed province in order, the King wished to canvass the bringing about of a war with the Ādil Shah which would justify his attack upon, and the taking possession of, Raichur, "as a very strong city and amongst the principal ones of the Ydallcao, who had taken it from the kings, his ancestors." Then he goes on to describe the difficulty that the king felt in having to break a peace, which had lasted forty years, for which Nuniz himself made no reference of any kind before. Then Śāḷuva Timma is made the author of a clumsy device to get over this difficulty, very much like the story in Herodatus of the Egyptians putting salt on a bird's tail to catch it. They hit upon the magnificent device to send a Muhammdan Syed Marcar, or some name like it, with 40,000 pagodas ostensibly to buy horses at Goa for the king, with instructions, at least a hint, to make away with the money into the territory of the Adil Shah. This course is seriously given out as having succeeded; and it is stated that the demand for extradition was as clumsily got over. The Syed concerned was sent over as Tanadhar of Dabul and some of the Portuguese authorities even state it that he was put to death under instructions from the Adil Shah, the later appropriating the money. No such qualms of conscience are referred to before the invasion of the Gajapati's territories. Krishṇa set forward against Udayagiri without any ado whatsoever.

Next to this when the embassy to the Adil Shah proved fruitless, as it was actually intended to be, some one is made

to say that invading the Adil Shah's dominions by way of Dabul would be futile, and that the better plan for the king to pursue would be to invade the Raichur Doab. This contradicts completely the previous statement that the whole arrangement came about for the purpose of taking Raichur out of deference to the wishes of Śāḷuva Narasimha I. Krishṇa is said to have laid the trap to catch the Adil Shah, and is exhibited here as having been oblivious of the importance of Raichur. Having accepted this advice as sound he informed the other Dakhan chiefs, 'sending letters to Madre Maluco, and Demellyno, and Desturvirido, and other superior lords, giving them an account of what had taken place in the matter of Ydallcao, and how he had determined to make war on him; from which lords he received answer that he was doing rightly, and that they would assist him as far as they were able. As to the Zemelluco, at the time when the messengers returned this answer he could find no excuse for not sending some troops to his sister who was wedded to the Ydallcao.' Of the lords mentioned in the above, Zemelluco friendly to the Adil Shah is Burhan Nizam-ul-Mulk, though he had married a sister of the Adil Shah and not given a sister in marriage to Ismail Adil Shah. The other three belonged to the hostile combination obviously. Madre Maluco should be Imad-ul-Mulk of Berar. He was more inclined to the side of the Adil Shah than otherwise, though at this time it is quite possible he was hostile because of the Nizam Shah's connection with the Adil Shah. Demellyno is obviously Kuṭub-ul-Mulk, and Desturvirido seems a compound of Dastur and Barid*.

* *Vide* p. 348, Sewell's Forgotten Empire.

These were the Dastur-ul Mulk, the son of Dastur Dinar, of Gulburga, Sagar and Naldrug, and Amir Barid of Bider. In other words the Adil Shah and the Nizam Shah held together; Imad Shah of Berar, Amir Barid of Bider, Kuṭub Shah of Golkoṇḍa and Dastur-ul-Mulk of Gulburga were hostile to these, and would be even actively friendly to *Krishṇadēvarāya*, who is stated to have sent intimation to them of set purpose to detach them from a possible combination. At the time in question a combination was quite an impossibility if Ferishta is to be believed. Ferishta has to be given credit for knowledge in respect of the affairs of the two Muhammadan states of the Adil Shahs and the Nizam Shahs. Nor do these States appear to have realized the value of a combination as their wars against the Nawabs of Khandesh and Guzerat would show. There is besides the fact that the two Southern chiefs were Shias and the others Sunni; and as between these there was very much more hatred than even between Muhammadans and Hindus. In this particular Nuniz may be correct in his statement.

The battle is said to have been fought in the month of May, on a new moon-day falling on a Saturday of the year 1522. Mr. Sewell has most satisfactorily proved that it actually did take place on the 19th May, 1520, when Soares, the Governor-General of Portuguese India was absent in the Red Sea. The Portuguese archives prove this to demonstration, and Nuniz is in error, showing thereby that his evidence is not as much of a first-hand character as it would at first sight appear.

'The king then set his huge army in motion against Raichur. The chief of the guard * led the advance with

* Kāma Nāyaka.

thirty-thousand infantry—archers, men with shields, and musquetteers and spearmen—and a thousand horse, and his elephants. After him went Timapanayque; * he had had with him sixty thousand foot and three thousand five hundred horse and thirty elephants; and after him went Adapanayque † with one hundred thousand foot and five thousand horse and fifty elephants. After him came Condamara, ‡ and he had one hundred and twenty thousand foot, six thousand horse and sixty elephants; after him came Comara, § and he had eighty thousand foot and of horse two thousand five hundred and forty elephants; after him the forces of Ogendraho, ¶ the governor of the city of Bisnaga, with one of his captains who had one thousand horse, thirty thousand foot and ten elephants. After him went three eunuchs, favourites of the king, who had forty thousand foot and one thousand horse and fifteen elephants. The page who served the king with betel had fifteen thousand foot and two hundred horse, but he had no elephants. Comarberca ‖ had eight thousand foot and four hundred

---

* Very likely Śāḷuva Timma.

† Possibly Adappanāyaningāru. This could mean the page of the Betel; but this functionary is referred to by his office lower down in the extract (vide A.S.R. 1908–9, p. 182, note 5).

‡ Koṇḍamarasa, Viceroy of Udayagiri Mahārājyam since its conquest.

§ The equivalent seems to be Kumāra. It may be one of the princes or one bearing the name.

¶ Gōvindarāja, *i.e.*, Śāḷuva Gōvinda, brother of Śāḷuva Timma.

‖ This is a variant of Kumāra Vīrayya (*vide* Sewell, p. 269, note 1 and p. 327, note 4). Both Nuniz and Paes connect this chief with Seringapatam. Mr. Sewell makes, in the note referred to above, a

horse and twenty elephants. The people of the chief of Bengapur went by another route with the people of Domar who were very numerous; and in the same way went other captains of ten or twelve thousand men, of whom I make no mention, not knowing their names. The king took up his guard six thousand horse and forty thousand foot, the pick of all his kingdom, men with shields, archers and three hundred elephants.

Totalling up, Mr. Sewell finds that the army was made up of much over 703,000 foot, 32,600 horse and 551 elephants, besides the troops which joined after, camp followers, &c. Astoundingly large as the numbers appear it does not seem quite beyond the capacity of the Empire of Krishṇadēva to put this number into the field. This might be regarded as an occasion when he wished to make an impression of power upon his Muhammadan neighbours. In the order above narrated the army set forward on its march till it reached Malliabad, where other detachments joined him.

The Muhammadan contingent of the Vijayanagar troops with Camanayque, the chief of the guard took their position nearest the ditch, every other chief taking the position allotted to him. The siege was carried on with vigour by

---

wrong connection with Mysore. The Mysore Oḍeyer's claim no connection with the Vijayanagar dynasties directly. Kumāra Vīrayya of Seringapatam was either the father or brother of Tirumalādēvi, a queen of Krishṇa. He may be the Vīrappoḍeya, son of Chikka Oḍeya of the inscription 30 of Mysore (cf. Sr. 10). The Mysore family got possession of Seringapatam only in A.D. 1610 (A.S.R. 1908–9, p. 182, note 5). Note the title of Chikkoḍaya: "*Śrīrangappaṭṭaṇada Śrīman Mahā Sēna Samudra Śāḷuva Gajasimha.*"

the assailants, the temptation of reward defying the terror of death, as the garrison from the protection of the strong fortifications dealt destruction freely among the assailants. There were in the fort, according to Nuniz, 8,000 men, 400 horse and 20 elephants with 30 catapults which hurled heavy stone and did great damage; and five years' supply for those. There were besides 200 heavy pieces of artillery. 'As soon as the people of the city knew of the arrival of the king's troops, and after they had received a captain of the Ydallcao who came with some soldiers to the city, they closed the gates with stone and mortar.' The north and south of the city being protected by natural rocks the attack was the strongest on the east as the king had pitched his camp on that side.

Information was now brought to him that the Adil Shah had encamped himself on the other side of the river. Each kept watching the movements of the other for some time. Having called for a muster and finding that his army was composed of 120,000 infantry, 1,800 horse and fifty elephants, with distinct superiority in artillery, the Adil Shah resolved upon an immediate crossing of the river to deliver the attack himself. He crossed the river unmolested and was allowed to encamp himself in a line along the river within three leagues of Krishṇa's camp. Krishṇa then ordered a general advance upon the enemy arranging his army in eleven divisions. The King ordered his front divisions to deliver the attack; perhaps under the command of Kumāra Vīrayya of Seringapatam; when this was hurled back in confusion and chased into the King's camp, he ordered a general charge, leading the attack himself. The suddenness of the onset and the weight with which it bore

down the enemy made the use of the artillery, on which the Adil Shah counted much, impossible. The Adil Shah's army was chased in hot pursuit right up to the banks of the river, the king himself occupying the Adil Shah's camp. The pursuit was stopped there, in spite of eager requests to press the advantage home.

As soon as the king moved out of his camp in front of Raichur, a party from among the garrison, consisting of 200 horse, and the necessary complement of foot and elephants sallied out of the fort and kept hanging on his flank on the river side. When the defeat of the Adil Shah became known, this party attempted a re-entry into the fort but was kept out by the garrison within, as there was enmity between the commanders of the garrison within, and of the party outside.

The king found among the prisoners five of the more important Commanders of the Adil Shah, including Salabat Khan, the Commander-in-Chief. The spoils of war included 4,000 horses of Ormuz, 100 elephants, and 400 heavy cannon besides small ones; there were besides 900 gun-carriages with many tents and pavilions. The king lost more than 16,000 of his army. The king then returned to his camp at Raichur and prosecuted the siege with greater vigour than ever before. Through the invaluable assistance of Christao de Figueyredo and his 20 musquetteers, who rendered service by sniping the garrison on the walls, the city fell on the 20th day after the battle of Raichur. Having shown the greatest clemency to the inhabitants of the fallen fortress, Krishṇa was about to start on his homeward march, when there arrived in his camp ambassadors

from the Zemelluco, (Nizam-ul-Mulk; Burban Nizam Shah), Madremalluco (Imad-ul-mulk); Destur (Dastur-ul-Mulk), Virido (Amir Barid) and other nobles of the kingdom of the Dakhan with messages of congratulation upon his victory, and a demand for the restoration of the Adil Shah's territory taken from him in the course of the war, on pain of their joining the Adil Shah and making common cause with him. Krishṇadēva returned a haughty answer that he would go and meet them himself rather than expect them, and set forward upon his march to Vijayanagar. While in residence at Hospet (*Nāgalāpura*) he received an ambassador from the Adil Shah who charged the king with having broken the peace of long duration and demanded restitution of all that he had taken from him. It was in reply to this that he is said to have given the famous reply that the Adil Shah should come and kiss his feet. The ambassador returned. Krishṇa is said to have gone to meet the Adil Shah on his frontier, and failing to meet him there marched upon Bijapur which he occupied for some time till he was compelled by water famine to quit the place. He returned by way of Mudkal. When the Adil Shah returned to Bijapur and saw the havoc worked on the beautiful city, he blamed himself for not having tendered his submission. Then Assaud Khan of Belgaum volunteered to go on a mission to Krishṇa who was then at Mudkal. Having arrived there, he threw the blame of the Adil Shah's recalcitrancy upon the commander-in-chief Salabat Khan who was then prisoner, and Krishṇa ordered his death in a rage. The order was carried out and Assaud Khan fled to Belgaum, his *jagīr*, from which he would not even go to headquarters. It was after

this futile mission that Krishṇa found vent to his anger in the destruction of Gulberga and in the attempt to set up one of the sons of Mahmud Shah II upon the throne of a united Bahmani kingdom 'giving his two brothers an annuity of 50,000 pagodas each. After the return of the king to Bisnaga, which took place in the same year in which he had left, nothing more passed between him and the Ydallcao worthy of record, relating either to peace or war.'

For facility of comparison, the account of Ferishta is set down here in his own words.*

"In the year 927, Ismael Adil Shah made preparations for marching to recover Moodkul and Rachore from the Ray of Beejanuggur; who gaining early intelligence of his intention moved with a great force, and stationed his camp on the banks of the Krishna, where he was joined by many of his tributaries; so that his army amounted to at least fifty thousand horse, besides a vast host of foot. The King would now have deferred his expedition, as the enemy held possession of all the ferries of the Krishṇa, but his tents being once pitched, he considered it would be undignified to delay. He therefore marched with seven thousand cavalry, composed entirely of foreigners and encamped on the bank of the river opposite to the Hindus waiting for the preparation of rafts to cross and attack. Some days after his arrival, as he was reposing in his tent, he heard one of his courtiers without the screens, reciting this verse: "Rise and fill the golden goblet with the wine of mirth, before the quaffer shall be laid in dust." The King, as if inspired by

* Briggs' Ferishta III, pp. 48-51.

the verse, called his favourites about him, and spreading the carpet of joy, gave way to the pleasure of music and wine. When the banquet had lasted longer than was reasonable, and the effects of the liquor began to exercise their influences, a fancy seized the King to pass the river and attack the enemy. He accordingly called on his Military Officers to state the cause of the delay in preparing the boats and rafts. He was told that one hundred boats were already finished, and the rest would be ready in a few days. The King heated with the banquet resolved to cross immediately; and mounting his elephant, without making his intentions known, proceeded to the river, as if to reconnoitre, but suddenly gave orders for as many of his troops as could go to embark on the rafts, directing others to follow him on elephants. The officers in vain represented the imprudence and danger of this precipitation; but the King, without reply, plunged his own elephant into the stream, and was instantly followed by some of his officers and soldiers, on about two hundred and fifty elephants. By great good fortune all reached the opposite bank in safety and as many troops as could cross on rafts and boats at two embarkations had time to arrive before the enemy opposed him. The Hindus, however, were in such force as precluded every hope of the King's success, with whom were not more than two thousand men to oppose thirty thousand. The heroes of Islam, as if animated with one soul, behaved so gallantly, that above a thousand of the infidels fell among whom was Sungut Ray, the chief general of Beejanuggur. The Mahomedans, however, found themselves so harassed by cannon shot, musketry and rockets which destroyed nearly half their numbers, that the survivors threw themselves

into the river, in hopes of escaping. Tursoon Bahadur and Ibrahim Beg, who rode on the same elephant with their King, drove the animal across the stream ; but so rapid was the current that with the exception of that elephant and seven others the rest were all drowned. The King's rashness was severely punished by so great a loss. He took a solemn vow never to indulge again in wine till he had wiped away the stain of this defeat ; and for this purpose he bent his whole mind to repair his misfortune.

Mirza Jehangeer having fallen in the late action, the King had recourse to the advice of Assaud Khan as to the measures necessary to retrieve his disaster. Assaud Khan observed, that as his loss was great, and the troops were dispirited, it would be advisable to return for the present to Beejapoor, and lay aside all thoughts of revenge till he could strengthen himself by an alliance with Burhan Nizam Shah, and remove his natural enemy Ameer Barid from his border. These objects being once effected, the punishment of the infidels might be subsequently accomplished. The King approving this advice marched from the Krishna to Beejapoor ; and conferring the dignity of Sipah-i-Salar on Assaud Khan, added several districts to his jageer, and made him henceforward his principal counsellor in all important affairs."

In the whole of Nuniz' narrative the part relating to the battle and the siege of Raichur bears the impress of a personal reminiscence, and may be taken as substantially a correct version of the facts.

The admission of a captain from the Adil Shah and the keeping out of one part of the garrison would warrant the

assumption that there has been some attempt to gain back Raichur on the part of the Adil Shah and so it must have been that Krishṇadēva went to repel a possible attempt at the capture of Raichur by the Adil Shah. Nuniz' attempt to give a reason for Krishṇa's breaking the peace with the Adil Shah does not stand on the same footing, as in regard to what took place in the Councils of Krishṇa, the chronicler could hardly have had any first hand information. One can understand Krishṇa's attempt to bring the Adil Shah to submission with a view to a final assertion of his superiority, though such an attempt naturally would stiffen up the Adil Shah and gain for him the sympathy of his brother chieftains of the Bahmani kingdom. For the phrase 'kissing the foot' is more Mussalman in character than Hindu, and means no more humiliation than a surrender at discretion. The actual fault of Krishṇa's policy towards these princes does come in when he is said to have made the attempt to set a Bahmani prince on the throne and put the other two princes on pension from the Treasury of Vijayanagar. This, however, as Mr. Sewell has pointed out, is historically inaccurate. The eldest of the three princes, who some time earlier were under honourable surveillance in Gulbarga, was nominally the Bahmani Sultan and actually was on the throne. The two others followed in the precarious but exalted position during the next few years after the battle. Here again, perhaps, is a confusion in post-dating a previous incident. Krishṇa might as well have attempted this when he made the raid against Gulbarga from Tirupati after the wars against the Gajapati. If such an attempt had actually been made successfully, as Nuniz would have us believe, inscriptions of a later date would

give indications in giving him a title such as the Dakshiṇa *Suratrāṇa or Kalvaraga Suratrāṇa sthāpanāchārya* or some equivalent of it. These documents are silent and the *Āmuktamālyadā* which mentions the destruction of Gulbarga and Sagare fails to mention Raichur. These transactions have to be dismissed as ill-founded, if not actually unfounded. Nor is the part of the year between the 10th of June and the end, enough for a return to Vijayanagar, then a pursuit of the Adil Shah as far as Bijapur, then a return to headquarters and a further invasion of Gulbarga.

The actual course of events would then appear to be that the Adil Shah made an attempt to recover Raichur and began operations by creating a party in his favour in Raichur and throwing in a powerful garrison. Krishṇa laid siege to the fort and attacked the enemy in the field. Defeating him in battle, he captured the town. Returning to headquarters, he undertook a raid into Bijapur territories with a view to striking terror into the heart of the enemy and bringing him to terms with but partial success. The peace lasted during his own life-time, but was no more permanent than that. There is an inconsistency in the attitude of the other Muhammadan chiefs as we find it depicted in Nuniz. These were in no condition to make any effective intervention possible. Nor had their internal jealousies had time to be forgotten. The possibility of dominance by Amir Barid, in whose possession the Bahmani princes were, was too real to admit of their concerting a common policy against their Hindu neighbours. This seems the position of international politics in the Dakhan derivable from a comparative reading of Ferishta

and the Portuguese chronicles, and more light is necessary to put the matter beyond doubt.

With the battle of Raichur and the events that followed close upon it, we come to the end of Krishṇarāya's wars and the remaining ten years were devoted to the work of peaceful administration. The dream of Śāḷuva Narasinga, or Narasimha, was realised, and the most troublesome neighbours were taught to respect the power of Krishṇa. The Empire was quite intact, as it was in the best days of his predecessors, nay as it never was either before or after him under the Vijayanagar rulers, except on the side of Goa where Belgaum had fallen into the hands of the Adil Shah, whose minister Assaud Khan held possession of it. According to the chronicle of Nuniz, Krishṇadēva abdicates in favour of his son Tirumalarāya, who died, according to the same authority, of poison administered to him by the minister Timmappa Daṇṇāyaka, son of Śāḷuva Timma. This story has in it inaccuracies which would stamp it as untrue. Krishṇa charged this Timmappa, his father Śāḷuva Timma and his brother Śāḷuva Gōvinda in public durbar and threw them in prison where they remained three years. At the end of this period Timmappa, the son escaped to a hill fort and held out against the king's forces for some time. When at last he surrendered to the superior force of Ayyapparasa (Ajaboissa of Nuniz), the eyes of the three prisoners were put out and they were allowed to languish in prison as they were Brahmans. Timmappa Nāyaka died in prison and Sāḷuva Timma and Gamdaja (another son) remained in prison says Nuniz. This last is perhaps only a mistake for Timma's brother Gōvindarāja.

There is no doubt that Krishṇa had a son Tirumalarāya who was old enough to be governor of a province. There are records of three others who call themselves sons also. Krishṇa had three queens ; Tirumalādēvi, the daughter of the king of Seringapatam (not of the royal family of Mysore), Chinnādēvi, generally taken to be a favourite dancing girl and his earliest love ; and lastly the Gajapati princess called Tukka in literature, whose name does not figure prominently otherwise. The former two have copper casts of them along with the king at Tirupati. Tirumalarāya was probably the son of Tirumalādēvi and appears to have predeceased his father. So far as the available inscriptions go, except for the fact that there is a grant made by Tirumalayyadēva, son of Krishṇarāya dated Śaka 1446,* there is no other mention of this prince in a ruling capacity. The other sons appear as equally subordinate govenors only. There is another record dated Śaka 1448† which states that Achyutarāya was ruling in Vijayanagara. With the exception of this single record there is nothing to indicate any break of continuity in the reign of Krishṇadēvarāya. On the contrary there are inscriptions from year to year even including this same Śaka year 1448 which state in so many words that Krishṇarāya was ruling in Vijayanagar. What is very much worse for the story of Nuniz, Śāḷuva Gōvindarāja, the brother of Śāḷuva Timma, instead of being a prisoner, eating his heart in Vijayanagar, makes a grant from his fief of Ummattūr in A. D. 1529. As far, therefore, as the evidence of inscriptions goes there is not the slightest

* 139 of 1896, Epigraphist's Collection.

† No. 34 A, Butterworth and Venugopala Chetty, Nellore Inscriptions.

sppport to this story of Nuniz, either about Krishṇa's abdication or of Śāḷuva Timma's treason against his sovereign. Nor has popular tradition handed down anything purporting this infamy on the part of the servant, or cruelty as against the master.* Krishṇa continued to rule till A.D. 1530; and, having beaten back an attempt to recover Raichur on the part of the Adil Shah, he died in the course of active preparations for an invasion of Belgaum.

The period of Krishṇa's rule was occupied in a series of efforts to restore to the Empire its integrity, and assure it a permanent peace. In both these he must be given credit for having achieved his objects. There was no sign of any trouble on the Kalinga side. Even on the Mussalman frontier the active operations of the Kuṭub Shah of Golkoṇḍa kept quite clear of the Vijayanagar frontier during the ten years of active warfare during Krishṇa's life-time. While still the wars were going on Krishṇa found time to actively direct the administration and carry out large schemes of works of public utility and beneficence. His benefactions to the temples of South India have been referred to already. He took an active interest in the fostering of both Sanskrit and Telugu literature having been himself an author of uncommon ability in both languages though only one Telugu work of his survives to-day to give us an idea of his activity in this direction. He was a Vaishṇava himself; but like all enlightened Hindu rulers with a tolerance of other persuasions which went far beyond mere sufferance into active benefactions. He kept

* Inscriptions at Tirupati show the brothers alive and actively participating in the temple affairs. See my History of Tirupati and the Volumes of the Inscriptions.

his eye well on the Governors and the Viceroys, so that no wrong-doing in the Empire, ever escaped notice. When such were brought to his notice he looked into the complaints with a conscientious interest that gave the best guarantee against the slightest miscarriage of justice. There are points in his career which require more elaborate treatment and will be given the fullness of treatment they deserve separately. The traditional date of death contained in a verse ascribed to Allasini Peddana takes the event five years earlier than it happened in A.D. 1530, as Krishṇa's records in Epigraphs reach up to that date.

(Lecture delivered to the Maharaja's College Union Society in the Rangacharlu Memorial Hall, Mysore with Mr. H. V. Nanjundayya, Vice-Chancellor in the chair. *Reprinted from the Hindustan Review for May, June and July 1917.*)

The Bakhair of Ramaraja

This is a document purporting to be written by one Rāmji Tirumal who was in attendance at the court of Vijayanagar on the eve of the battle of Talikota. No more is known of him from the document. The name is clearly a Mahratta name. The language of the document is a popular form of Kanarese, very far from the literary idiom, and even from that of the Kanarese of purely Kanarese speaking people. Apart from the mere mixture of foreign terms it gives clear evidence that the writer was a foreigner writing the language owing to official exigencies. He has made the effort to the best of his accomplishments. This character of the language is a clear indication that he was the agent of a court where the official language was Kanarese. He was probably an agent of one of the subordinate states of the Empire attached to the Imperial Headquarters.

There is a *Bakhair* on this subject in Mahratti, and the question naturally arises whether the Mahratti document or the Kanarese is the original. Not having access to the Mahratti as yet, and, judging only from the Kanarese record, the latter does not seem to be a translation, but appears to have been written in original in Kanarese itself. I am informed that the Mahratti paper published already is but an abridged abstract of this paper, but a little more investigation is required for a definite opinion upon this question.

The document in question begins with the arrival of a *Mahaldar* (divisional officer) of Bijapur in the court of Vijayanagar conveying messages of importance from the Adil Shah to the court of Vijayanagar. The two courts were on friendly terms, and the ambassador was hospitably received and accommodated in the *Ānandamahāl* palace. A few days after, the ambassador sought and obtained audience, and when it was over the court adjourned to witness a performance in acrobatics by a troupe of Telugu Dombars. Rāmarāja was pleased with the troupe and ordered presents of various kinds. The troupe however, sought the favour of two full grown pigs being presented to them as these people regarded pork as a dainty apparently. The Mussalman ambassador started moralizing upon the unworthiness of the Hindu religion which permitted its votaries, however humble in station, eating such filthy flesh. Rāmarāja was apparently a man who had something of the humorous in him, and he asked in reply if it was permissible for Muhammadans to eat fowl. The Mussalman ambassador assenting, he ordered a building to be vacated and pigs stalled in for the night. The ambassador was shown into the building the next morning when it was full of filth, and then a number of fowls were let in· Before evening, the building had become almost clean and then the Rāja observed to the ambassador whom he had taken with him that eaters of fowl had little cause to hold in contempt those that eat pork. This was too much for the temper of the Mussalman ambassador who forgot the mission of his master and wanted to terminate his mission. Rāmarāja however, persuaded him to stay on and dismissed him with due ceremony later.

The irate ambassador had not forgotten "the insult" and went into the court of the Adil Shah with his turban tied round his neck, and tried to persuade his master into believing that the Muslim authority was no more in that region, and no Muslim is likely to be respected so long as Vijayanagar was allowed to stand in this position of command. The Adil Shah took a saner view, and pointed out that he stood to Rāmarāja in the position of a son, and that he had no cause of war against him standing as he did in that affectionate relation with him.

The *Mahaldar* took his departure from Bijapur, and found himself more welcome in another quarter. He found the three others of the Bahmani Sultans (Bider apparently not counting for much) encamped in Jahlna, and enjoying the hospitality of the Nizam Shah. Thither he went and depicted the low estate to which the Dakhan Muslims had brought themselves by letting Rāmarāja remain ruler of Vijayanagar. He found here more congenial audience than at Bijapur, and succeeded in persuading the three Sultans to resolve upon invading the territory of Vijayanagar with a view to reduce it to a condition tributary to the Mussalmans of the Dakhan. Having resolved to make a joint invasion of the Hindu territory they sent a persuasive ambassador to the Adil Shah to influence him to join the holy cause. The Adil Shah stood firm and gave this ambassador the same answer that he did to his own *Mahaldar*.

Meanwhile information of all that transpired in Jahlna was sent to Rāmarāja by his own agent Timmāji from Jahlna; and soon after arrived a messenger from the agent stationed at Bijapur. The Dassara celebrations had just

come to a close. Rāmarāja immediately issued a warning to all his assembled feudatories to get ready for war, and conduct themselves worthy of the Empire in the forthcoming war; and then dismissed them with the usual presents, bestowed with more than usual liberality. He sent a special ambassador in the person of his commander-in-chief Bisālappa Nāyaka to Bijapur with rich presents to the Adil Shah. The Adil Shah received the embassy with due consideration and respect, and was quite pleased with the presents and showed the same friendly spirit that he did on previous occasions. The manner of reception of this embassy and the re-assertion of the same friendly relations between the Adil Shah and Rāmarāja were duly communicated to the Sultans by their agents in Bijapur. They sent another ambassador to point out to him the unworthiness and danger of a Mussalman ruler being in alliance with the Hindu ruler as against his brethren. He was instructed to communicate with them that the three Sultans were determined to march upon Vijayanagar, and that if the Adil Shah faild to co-operate with them, they would none the less march through his territories against Vijayanagar. The Adil Shah pointed out in reply that at that time the Hindu ruler was in a most powerful position and the three Sultans would do well to deliberate before taking action. Bisālappa Nāyaka returned with information of all that took place in Bijapur and kept his master fully informed of the coming invasion. In a council held in consequence, the council unanimously tendered him the advice that he should forestall the invasion of Vijayanagar territory and meet the enemy across his frontier. Rāmarāja issued orders accordingly and sent forward the advance

portion of the army. He then went into the palace to take permission of his mother and queens. He took leave of his queens first, and then went to his mother who advised peaceful negotiations which he did not accept.

The next morning he ordered a general muster of all his troops, with the requisite treasure, and set forward on the march. The army marched across the river and occupied the country on the other side to a distance of eight *gavudas* (fifty to sixty miles), along the bank of the river pushing forward pickets and advance posts almost up to the Krishna. The King himself fixed his camp between the townlets of Tavaragere and Krishṇagiri. The Nizam Shah with the Governor of Daulatabad encamped himself near the river Krishna at Firozabad otherwise Sultanpur. Jalaluddin Akbar Padusha encamped himself at Daggada (Durgada), Mahiber Himbal Kuṭub Shah fixed his camp between Raichur and Mudgal; while Imam-ul-mulk and Ali Adil Shah fixed their camp at Jamalgar near the river Krishna. The light troops belonging to all the Mussalman armies had already crossed the Krishna river and had been committing depredations in the territory of Vijayanagar. The feudatories of the Hindu empire who had arrived at the head of the armies, fixed, under the orders of the emperor, their camp at a place called *Rākshasa-Taṅgaḍi*. Rāmarāja sent forward a considerable portion of his own troops also to the advance post at *Rākshaśa-Taṅgaḍi*.

Information of these movements was sent to the four *Padushas* who ordered a forward movement and took up a position within striking distance of *Rākshasa-Taṅgaḍi*. Then began the battle between the advance posts which

gradually developed into full battle which lasted for three days and still remained indecisive. The Nizam Shah's troops and the Kuṭub Shah's troops acquitted themselves well and gave satisfaction to their rulers; while the Adil Shah and his ally who is called here Bahim-ul-mulk remained inactive, only making a show of fight, if the Hindu army attacked them. In consequence Rāmarāja sent Daḷavāi Girappa and Jamadar Khanipavadi Nāyaka to the Adil Shah to point out to him that it was not fair that he should join other Mussalman rulers and carry on war against the Hindu Emperor who brought him up almost like a son, and provided for his milk money, the three fortresses of Raichur, Mudgal and Adoni. The Adil Shah protested that he did not enter the war of his own accord, and that the war was forced upon him by the other three entering his territory and cutting their way across forests and hills without his permission. He had no alternative but to join them. He admitted, however, that it was through evil counsel after all that he entered the war, and sent the usual return embassy. Information of these transactions however reached the Nizam Shah at Daulatabad, the Kuṭub Shah at Golkoṇḍa and Akbar Jalal-ud-din Mughal at Jahlna. Having consulted together, these three sent to the Adil Shah the following ultimatum; "You joined us in the invasion against the Hindu territory, and now you are holding diplomatic relations with the Hindu ruler. If you will not adopt a more friendly attitude towards us and join us in the war, we shall declare war against you as well." The Adil Shah in fear of the consequences sent word that their resolution was his resolution, and that he would join heartily in the enterprise.

While these transactions were taking place here, Rāmarāja changed his headquarters to *Rākshasa-Tangaḍi* and established his camp there. Then began another battle which lasted for 27 days. Fresh Muhammadan armies arrived and took their position in the plains of Talikota. The battle on the 27th day lasted till the 9th hour of the night and still remained undecided. The principal leaders and Princes in the Hindu army came out to Rāmarāja and pointed out to him the futility and wastefulness of this kind of warfare. They suggested breaking up into separate division, each division carrying the war against particular parts of the enemy's army. They also pointed out that both the Adil Shah and Imad-ul-mulk were not hearty in the fight and were merely making a show. He adopted their suggestions and sent out his army to attack in separate divisions and then the battle began again. Jalal-ud-din Akbar fell back upon the Nizam Shah's forces. The two together fought against the Hindu forces and both of them were pressed back. Some of them fell back upon their camp. Then Rāmarāja wished to press the advantage home and mounted his elephant *Rājahamsāmṛta*, and marched into the field directing operations in person. Then the battle went on for 3 days, going into the 9th hour of the night on the last day. This time the Muhammadans were definitely defeated and had to fall back two units (about 5 to 6 miles). Taking this for a retreat the army slackened their efforts and Rāmarāja himself ceased to press the advantage home. The three *Padushas* on the contrary took counsel together, and sent to the Adil Shah charging him to exert himself at least now, to save the Mussalman name from extinction. Then the

Adil Shah got ready, offered his third prayer for the day invoking the assistance of God for the Muhammadan cause, and fell upon the army of the Hindus, and, the three others co-operating, the Hindu camp was thrown into confusion and Rāmarāja did his best to collect his army and tried to make an effective stand. In the meanwhile, he sent word to the Adil Shah pointing out the unworthiness of his action against one who brought him up like a father. He followed it up by saying that in case he should still persist in the course of action he had adopted he would at least do him one favour. He requested the Adil Shah to shoot him with his gun and kill him, and thus save him from falling into the hands of his enemies, the three other Padushahs, and prepared himself for being shot. After some deliberation the Adil Shah resolved to do so and shot him dead. When news of this reached the Hindu camp, the army broke up, some of them fleeing to Vijayanagar. The three other Padushahs were delighted that their enemies were no more effective, and the Muhammadan armies engaged themselves in plundering the camps of the Hindus. When news of Rāmarāja's death reached Vijayanagar, his mother and three of his queens put an end to themselves and the army of the three Padushahs marched upon Vijayanagar plundered the treasury and other places where loot could be had, and marched back to their headquarters. The Adil Shah of Bijapur dismissed Akbar Jalal-ud-din with presents and sent the bones of Rāmarāja to Benares for being deposited in the Ganges. He then marched upon Penukoṇḍa which he beseiged. After a siege of six weeks, he left an army to conduct the siege and returned to his capital. Rāmarāja's death took place,

according to the Bakhair, in the year *Raktākṣi*, *Vaiśākha Bahuḷa 8*, Monday *Śravaṇa Nakṣatra*.

The above is a more or less free summarised account of the Bakhair as it is, and does not pretend to be a regular translation which will be given on a future occasion from the original manuscript itself, comparing it with the Mahratti Bakhair, if possible. We shall offer some remarks upon the historical part of the document now and enter into a brief discussion as to its historical bearing.

Readers of Sewell's "*Forgotten Empire*" will find, on referring to Chapter XV, that his account is based on the Muhammadan historians, Ferishta and the anonymous historian of the Kuṭub Shahi; and the Portuguese writer Couto differs materially in very many particulars. Omitting the minutiae and having regard only to the incidents leading to the decisive event, the first point which calls for attention is who it was that was really responsible for the coalition of the Muhammadan Princes. According to the Bakhair translated above, the actual responsibility for the combination rests with the Mahaldar of Bijapur, while the Adil Shah is exhibited throughout as having been steadily loyal in his alliance with the Hindu ruler. Ferishta makes the coalition originate with the Adil Shah himself, who having resolved to bring about the coalition sent his councillor Kishwur Khan Lary to take steps to bring about the coalition. He sent an embassy forthwith to the Kuṭub Shah, and subsequently to the Nizam Shah as well (Brigg's *Ferishta* III, pages 123-126). The anonymous Muhammadan writer whom Briggs translated in the same volume ascribes the authorship of this effort to Ibrahim Kuṭub Shah

(*vide* Briggs Ferishta III, pages 412–413). The Kuṭub Shah is credited with having brought about the alliance sealed by a double marriage between the Nizam Shah and the Adil Shah, the fact of which is testified to by Ferishta himself. On the other hand the Nizam Shahi historian Sayid Ali ascribes the credit to Hussain Nizam Shah although he agrees that it was the Kuṭub Shah's ambassador who conducted the negotiations with the Adil Shah (*Indian Antiquary* for 1921, page 143ff.) There is no mention of the whole of this transaction in the Bakhair of Rāmji Tirumal. What is more, almost up to the end of the battle the Adil Shah kept hovering, according to this account, between his allegiance to his friend, the Hindu ruler, and his obligation to his colleagues of the Dakhan.

The next point calling for attention is the actual place of battle. Mr. Sewell has a note on page 199 of his book (the reprint) that the battle did not take place at Talikota but many miles south of the River Krishna, Talikota being situated twenty-five miles north of the river. He remarks "The Battle took place ten miles from Rāmarāja's camp south of the river, wherever that may have been. There is no available information on the point, but it was probably at Mudkal, the celebrated fortress." He offers the suggestion that the battle might actually have taken place at or about the little village called Bayapur or Bhogapur on the road leading from Ingalgi to Mudkal. The Bakhair on the contrary, makes it clear that the first camp of the Muhammadans, as in fact their main camp afterwards, remained round Talikota. But he makes it clear none the less that no engagement of a war-like character took place in that vicinity. He makes the further point clear that Rāmarāja's

headquarters were fixed at a place called Tavarakere near the north bank of the Tungabhadra, and a part of his army and the contingents were ordered to fix their camp at *Rākshasa-Tangaḍi* to which he himself moved his headquarters at a later stage of the war. The battles were actually fought about ten miles from his camp at Rākshasa-Tangaḍi; it would be somewhere about twenty miles south of the river Krishna and almost fifty miles from where Talikota is. Further than that the Bakhair gives the disposition of the Muhammadan armies. The Nizam Shah's headquarters were at Firuzabad, otherwise, Sultanpur. Jalal-ud-din Akbar Moghul as he is sometimes called, was not the Moghul Emperor as he is taken to be; he was apparently a feudatory of Bijapur. The term "Moghul", attached to his name signified the party of foreign Muhammadans in the Dakhan at the time, as opposed to the two other parties, the Abyssinians called the Habshi, and the Indian Muhammadans called the Dakhanis.' He fixed his camp between Raichur and Mudkal; while Imam-ul-mulk and the Adil Shah fixed their camp at Jamalgarh near the Krishna on the road to Bijapur. Somewhere within the curve of this semi-circle must have been Rākshasa-Tangaḍi and the scene of the battle must have been within the segment marked by the camp of the Mahammadans and a straight line drawn through *Rākshasa-Tangaḍi*. It is worth noting here that this is what is corrupted into *Rakshitta Gunḍee* in Mahratti Mss. according to Duff. (Hist. of Mahrattas, Vol. I, p. 59, Cambray's Edition.)

In regard to the date of the battle, Mr. Sewell takes it on the authority of both the Muhammadan chronicles, *viz.*, the anonymous history of the Kuṭub Shahi and Ferishtas'

history, to be some date in January 1565 the actual day being Tuesday, 23rd January (Tuesday being the week day according to him), whereas Ferishta fixed the day as Friday, the 20th of *Jamad-oos-sany* A. H. 927. According to Sayid Ali's Burhan-i-Ma-āsir, this victory was won on Friday Jumadi-ul-akhir A. H. 972, January 4th, 1565 (*Indian Antiquary* 1921, page 194). The day given in the Bakhair for the death of Rāmarāja is the year *Raktākṣi* the month of *Viśākha* 8th day, the dark fortnight, *Monday Śravaṇa Nakṣatra*. According to Mr. Swamikannu Pillai's Ephemeris the year *Raktākṣi* began on Tuesday, the 28th March 1564 according to the solar reckoning; the lunar year began on Monday the 13th March 1564. The month of *Viśākha* began on Wednesday, the 10th April of the same year. According to the same author, *Bahuḷa* 8th will fall on Tuesday, the 8th of May; whereas if Monday be taken as correct it would be the 5th *idem*. As the *Nakṣatra Śravaṇa* falls on Monday, the 5th of May, I am rather inclined to prefer that the actual day of the year is *Viśākha Bahuḷa* 5th, Monday *Śravaṇa Nakṣatra*, as, in the Kanarese script, 5 can easily be corrupted into looking like 8, and a mistake is easily possible. If this correction should be accepted, then the day given would answer to the day given here in 1564; the week day and the *Nakṣatra* agree. If, according to Sewell, their march south from the plains of Talikota began on the 25th of December 1564, the final battle could not have taken place in January 23 following, if the details given of the various battles in the Bakhair should at all be true. Mr. Sewell's account gives only one engagement, whereas Rāmji Tirumal describes three separate engagements of

which one lasted as many as 27 days. The history of the Kuṭub-Shahi which apparently Mr. Sewell has followed, also describes only one final engagement; and neither Ferishta nor the Kuṭub Shahi historian, nor the Burhan-i-Ma-āsir of Sayid Ali gives the details of the other engagements given in the Bakhair. Since the war began with such determination on either side, that it should have been decided by a single engagement seems hard to believe. There are other discrepancies besides between these authorities, which have to be accounted for.

This account of Rāmji Tirumal begins with the first movement towards the war during the Dassara of the previous year, *i.e.*, about the month of October 1563, when the feudatory princes received a warning to be ready. Then it was resolved to carry the war into the enemy's territory to avoid danger to his own. In accordance with this resolution, forces had to be collected and troops had to be moved to their main rendezvous across the Tungabhadra. Then the emperor had to move with his own headquarters and follow the army, and then the war actually began by preliminary negotiations developing into a regular war which ceased almost at the end of about a month, and then began the final engagement which lasted for three days. All this would have involved time naturally, and the time allowed in the Bakhair seems necessary for the complicated movements implied in this account. Apart from mere movements of armies, room is wanted for diplomatic negotiations of which there were several missions, backward and forward, and the time between October and May would be well filled with all these. From the side, therefore, of the Hindu Emperor the account given by this writer strikes

one as cogent and consistent dealing only with the antecedent circumstances leading to the crucial battle. For what actually were the remote causes of this crucial battle and for the movement of the Muhammadans, this account is inadequate and must be supplemented by what can be gleaned from the other historians. In some particulars the Kuṭub Shahi history seems to be more detailed and reliable.

The next point in which this Bakhair is somewhat definite is the fate that befell Rāmarāja. According to the hitherto accepted account Rāmarāja fell into the hands of the enemy at the end of a day's battle when victory actually declared for the Hindu side, and that he was decapitated by the Nizam Shah. There are also prevalent popular accounts that this catastrophy was due to the treachery of the Muhammadan contingents of the empire of Vijayanagar, chiefly based perhaps on the authority of Cæsar Frederic who was at the Imperial City two years later. The Bakhair written by a Hindu *Mahratta* in the court of Rāmarāja does not lend colour to the first statement, or the next surmise. There is no mention of the treachery of the Muhammadan contingent or contingents, and the end of Rāmarāja is depicted entirely differently. In fact, the whole of the attitude of the Adil Shah* as

*This account in the Bakhair seems to receive some support from what the Nizam Shahi historian states regarding the decapitation of Rāmarāja. "As soon as the Adil Shah heard of the capture of Sadāsiva Rāya † he hastened to the spot with the design of releasing the accursed infidel; but Hussain Shah being aware that Ali Adil Shah would press for the Rāja's release, which it would be folly to grant, and that a refusal to grant it would only lead to strife between the allies, and to the rupture of the alliance, issued orders for the execution of Sadāsiva Rāya before Ali Adil Shah could arrive."

†(This is the name by which this historian indicates Rāmarāja throughout.)

depicted here is different from that of the Muhammadan historians from what one could make out from the two Muhammadan histories referred to above. It was the Adil Shah who was responsible for the death of Rāmarāja at the Rāja's own request. He went so far as to have the bones of his benefactor deposited in the Ganges for the good of his soul. This is in lurid contrast to the somewhat barbarous performance ascribed to the Nizam Shah who is said to have taken vengeance upon the dead body of the Rāja for the sufferings that, while living, he inflicted upon the Muhammadan subjects of his neighbours.

Radical differences between the accounts, however, appear in regard to the one among the Muhammandan rulers, who was mainly responsible for the combination of the Muhammadan rulers. Ferishta makes the Adil Shah responsible for it; the Kuṭub Shahi historian makes Ibrahim Kuṭub Shah take the initiative. The Nizam Shahi historian gives the credit to the Hussain Nizam Shah. The Bakhair on the contrary does not actually trace it to the source, but begins merely with the arrival of the Mahaldar from Bijapur. This has to be interpreted not as Rāmji Tirumal not knowing it, but merely as his not treating of it in this report. The hint is conveyed to us of the assemblage of the three Muhammadan princes in Jahlna. In regard to this matter both the Hindu account and the Kuṭub Shahi account have to be read together. The Hindu account begins after the negotiations which brought about the combination of the three other Sultans than the Adil Shah. Therefore it seems very much more likely that it was Ibrahim Kuṭub Shah who saw the common danger ahead and brought about the combination. It seems perfectly natural that the Adil

Shah should have wavered between his loyalty to his benefactor, the Hindu Rāja, and his allegiance to his colleagues of the faith. The Bakhair of Rāmji Tirumal describes exactly in those terms, and perhaps shows his character to advantage in regard to the Adil Shah's part in the battle. It was neither faint-heartedness on the part of the Adil Shah, nor mere faithlessness. It was much rather the indecisiveness of a more conscientious person who hesitated between loyalty to the faith and gratitude for benefits received and enjoyed. The account given in the Bakhair seems credible, and creditable to the Adil Shah. These are the main points that emerge from a study of the Bakhair in the light of the information we already possess, on this war of Vijayanagar against the united Muhammadans, culminating in the destruction of the Imperial city. Further research and investigation may add to the light already thrown by this new source of information, on this important event in the history of the Hindu Empire.

(*A paper read at the Seventh Meeting of the Indian Historical Records Commission held at Poona; the late Sir Evan Cotton in the Chair, in January 1925.*)

Penugonda

NOTE :—*This brochure is the outcome of a hurried visit I paid to Penugoṇḍa at the invitation of my friend Mr. T. Sivasankaram, M.L.C. At his suggestion I put together the substance of a lecture delivered at the local High School on " Penugoṇḍa in its historical setting," with a view to exhibit to Their Excellencies the Governor and Lady Willingdon on their forthcoming visit, the historical importance of the place. I hope that this slight sketch will serve the purpose in some small measure. The place deserves closer study which can be made only by a systematic collection of the monumental remains in a museum in the town arranged and catalogued to assist alike the student and the layman as the Director-General of Archaeology has done for other historical sites in North India. Inscriptions do not take us beyond the age of Vijayanagar, but there are vestiges of great Chāḷukyan monuments of the age of the Hoysalas and before.*

It may be that archaeological research takes us farther back. " The Gahan Mahal " may be utilized for the purposes by conserving it as an ancient monument and housing in it other monumental remains. It is to be hoped that the visit of Their Excellencies may lead to this desirable consummation.

Its place in South Indian History generally and the Empire of Vijayanagar in particular.—Penugoṇḍa, as it is at the present time, is a townlet of about 6,000 population, and is couped up in the hollow of a basin surrounded by hills so closely that there is little room for cultivation to meet the needs of the expanding population of a growing town. It has, however, potentialities of expansion even now, which, with sufficient

enterprise, could be made to provide what is wanted for the needs of a royal city such as it was for a number of centuries under Hindu rule. If one gets up the top of the highest of the peaks in the group close to the town and takes a bird's-eye view of it, he will find vestiges of human handiwork that must have supplied the various needs of a vast population. If such a one cast his glance across the plain, he will find the plain in the hollow surrounded by a cluster of hills lying in serried ranks of various heights one behind the other, as if each were set there specially to prevent access to the plain from outside. One great road cuts across the middle of the plain leading southwards to Bangalore and northwards through Guntakal to Raichur and ultimately to Hyderabad almost in a straight line. That seems the only feasible way across the plain. This roadway and the plain which it cuts in two are shut in by high hills on the west rising sheer from a vast stretch of plain country, comparatively barren and uncultivated. The biggest hill is in three peaks, with another hill of a slightly inferior height standing close, the four together constituting a natural buttress commanding the extensive plain outside. The natural strength of these is improved by artificial fortifications which make up for the defects that Nature had left. The highest knoll is surmounted by a fortified bastion affording room for the movement of a few guns which could be used with deadly effect upon an approaching army from any side. The top is reached by a bridle path which may be about 2½ to 3 miles in length. Halfway up the hill along this path lies a saddle at the distance of a mile between two hills. This is surmounted by a temple dedicated to *Lakṣmī-Narasimhasvāmi* (the

man-lion avatar of Viṣṇu) which has adjoining it a tank providing the necessary water-supply for the normal requirements of the temple, and the periodical concourse of people congregating there for festivals. These hills offer effective protection against attacks or hostile entry on the western side, and, under the shadows of these high walls of nature, lay the royal part of the city with its palaces, temples and tanks, all enclosed in a circuit of stone walls of an inner fort with its four main gates and a number of posterns. The bridle path up the hill, and another, a much shorter and well-guarded path-way up the hill, both of them lie within the walls of the fort in the town. This bridle path is probably a more modern one, and was perhaps made for facilitating visits to the temple of Narasimha already referred to. The other path is well-guarded at the narrower gorges of which there are three before reaching the middle terrace and two more before one reaches the top. The total number is counted as seven and this number is likely to be correct as we cut across portions of the path-way. Each one of these "passes" is fortified and provided with a guard house, a store for the contingent keeping guard and an unfailing supply of water in a hill-cleft containing springs. These are built up with stone-steps so that men may go down to the water, and seem generally to have been kept in good condition for use. It is said that these stages are connected with each other by secret passages; one such is pointed out at the topmost "*Kiḷḷa*" (fort). This is a passage for one man to creep through while it is certain death for any second man to enter at the same time.

The town itself is now confined to one part of the plain which might have been occupied fully with it, but

the number of stone-built wells in various parts of it and the large temples now in ruins or in the occupation of Muhammadan mosques are clear enough indication of the vaster extent of the town area. Two villages one west and the other east seem to mark the outermost town limit of those days. These are Somandahalli about 3 miles west where the Emperors of Vijayanagar kept their cows in herds and got their milk supply from. The other is Erramanchi about 6 or 7 miles to the north which seems to have given an alternative name to the province itself, called *Penugoṇḍarājya* or *Erramanṭirājya* in the more popular form, in which Bukkapaṭna is described to have been situated in records of the reign of Krishṇarāya and his brother Achyutarāya. One of the gates of the fort takes its name after this.

The remaining part of the plain is almost unoccupied at present, and the trunk road to Bangalore passes right across it north and south. The part of the plain on the farther side of the road slowly rises up to the cluster of low hills lying in semi-circles one behind the other. Across this cluster there seems a feasible pass for a road. This is however barricaded by piling up stone boulders, big and small, in such a fashion as to make it infeasible for cavalry. Hence the present-day name for this obstruction "*Gurrapu-rāḷḷu*" (horse-boulders). This defence makes the eastern side secure against attacks by Muhammadan Cavalry. The west is inaccessible by nature; the south and the north are open to entry but could be easily defended. Such are the natural features of the plain in which is situated what is now the town, and which should have held what was the

royal capital for more than a century, and a first class provincial headquarters for nearly three centuries before.

The existing walls and gates of the fort with its moat, still visible in certain parts, seem to mark the citadel in which was situated the royal palace, and the temples and buildings appurtenant thereto. The greater part of the city seems to have lain outside these walls. Inside the fort is now shown the vestiges of a number of temples in various stages of ruins. The most noteworthy among these happen to be the Narasimhaswāmi temple turned into the Jumma Musjid, and another Vishṇu temple transformed into the Jain shrine of Parsvanātha. Penugoṇḍa was early famous as one of the eighteen Jain centres of reputation; but the present shrine did not belong to Parsva. There is a standing *Dvārapāla* figure with the disc and the conch, the unmistakable signs of Vaishṇava persuasion. Another peculiarity of this is that the figure carries these two weapons into the inner two hands, the outer two carrying each a lotus—a characteristic of Chāḷukyan and later Hoysala iconography. The Musjid referred to above shows clear signs of transformation as the outer entrance still has all the decorative panels, pillars and pilasters intact. The inner portion or the mosque proper is now so well plastered that it seems entirely a Muhammadan structure. This should not necessarily be the case, as there are other instances in the locality of this complete transformation of Hindu temples into Muhammadan structures by plastering over and otherwise giving them such other outside touches as would make them seem wholly Islamic in character. This feature is illustrated in the remains of the palace

called "Gahan Mahal" in the immediate vicinity. This building is apparently a part of the inner palace intended for the occupation of the royal ladies, and the part of the structure must have occupied one end of a spacious enclosure. The upper part of this structure must have served originally the double purpose of serving as a vantage ground from which to view various kinds of entertainments taking place in the great yard, and of serving as the confidential reception room for the ruler, who received his ministers and ambassadors here for confidential discussions. On the pinnacle of this building are two turrets, one larger than the other. The larger is in the Hindu style. The smaller of the same style is given a parapet of the Islamic pattern. This and the same style of parapet round the whole shows the effort, very clumsy as it proves on closer examination, at transforming the building into a Muhammadan palace.

Set diagonally over against this is the shapely minar of the Sher Khan's mosque as it is called—a structure said to have been constructed in the thirties of the eighteenth century. The well just outside and the flag-stone pavement give clear indications of the Hindu character of the structure. One of the stones on the pavement carries an inscription of a date ten years earlier than the battle of Talikota, which event transferred the capital of the empire of Vijayanagar to Penugoṇḍa. What is much more of a tell-tale character in the structure is the nich constituting the shrine. The Muhammadan attendant somewhat officiously exhibits two rotating pillars by the side of the door jambs with all the gusto of a miracle. On closer examination

the rotating pillars turn out to be door ornaments intended by the Chāḷukyan architect to show various panels of gods and goddesses, supplemental to those in the door jambs. These are now covered up with thin slabs of polished stone, showing niches for holding lights. This is carried out only so far as the uprights are concerned. The archway over is left over as in the original, and shows the characteristic lotus ornament. It is possible to remove the thin slabs now; and it may be quite worth while to have these removed temporarily and a few photographic views taken of the original doorway as it was intended to be. These photographs will give unmistakable evidence of the transformation of what was the sanctum of an early Chāḷukyan temple into the "Kalaba" of a Muhammadan mosque. There is much more direct evidence of the past structure of a Chāḷukyan temple in what is now called Baba Fakruddin's mosque close by.

These vestiges give clear evidence of the place having been a town of considerable importance in Chāḷukyan times from the tenth to the twelfth century A.D. It maintained that position under the Hoysalas and under the earlier dynasties of Vijayanagar. It had grown to be of greater importance under the great Krishṇa and his immediate successors. When the empire suffered a defeat at Talikota, Penugoṇḍa became the royal capital, and in consequence the centre of attack by the forces of Golkoṇḍa generally, sometimes in co-operation with the forces of Bijapur, the two southern kingdoms of the Bahmani Sultans. Penugoṇḍa in its turn fell as the result of repeated attacks, and with its fall may be dated the fall of the Empire of Vijayanagar. We shall now proceed to narrate briefly the story

of Penugoṇḍa from her days of royal splendour to those of ruin and decay.

The district of Anantapur always constituted an important salient to be guarded against attack by the rulers of the table-land which now constitutes the State of Mysore. Places like Nidugal and Hemavati (Henjeru) were headquarters of chieftaincies which came into notice with the rise of the later Chāḷukyas of Kalyāṇi. Before their rise to power the district seems to have constituted a part of the Pallava and Chōḻa territories, and the chieftains of Nidugal claimed descent from the Chōḻas and took Chōḻa titles. With the rise of the Western Chāḷukyas of Kalyāṇi this became a frontier viceroyalty set over against the kingdom of Vēngi, the territory of the Eastern Chāḷukyas rapidly passing under Chōḻa influence. Henjeru (Hemavati) is generally described in the inscriptions of this period as "the bolt of the South". This was intended to mean that it barred the way of advance to the South for any northern or Dakhan Power. This was the function that devolved upon Penugoṇḍa when it rose into importance. Very few Chāḷukya inscriptions in Penugoṇḍa have survived the onslaught of the Muhammadans; but the vestiges of Chāḷukyan temples, images and various other items of temple architecture show unmistakably that it was a place of considerable importance under that dynasty. Under the last great Hoysala, Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III, it was the headquarters of an important Governorship which office was held in A.D. 1328 by one Māchayya Daṇḍanāyaka, who seems to have been a close relative of the ruler himself. It is found maintaining that position during the troubled

times that followed the invasions of the South under Muhammad, the Tughlak (A.D. 1325-1351). In the last year of the reign we have mention of Bukka, the third of the five brothers associated with the foundation of the Empire of Vijayanagar, as the Governor of Penugoṇḍa and upraiser of the Hoysala dynasty. His elder brother Harihara I is heard of already in A.D. 1333 as ruling in the Southern Mahratta country under the last great Hoysala, and exercised authority as overlord of the Muhammadan Sultan Jamaluddin of Honovar on the West Coast. Some ancient Tamil chronicles refer to Bukka's son Kampaṇa or Kumāra Kampaṇa, as the "door-keeper" (Gentleman-in-waiting) upon the Hoysala monarch. We are thus justified in regarding that these brothers, and even their grown-up sons, were officers of the Hoysalas.

In the early years of the fourteenth century Muhammadan raids had been carried successfully as far south as Rāmēśvaram and Madura; and soon after, the Muhammadan garrisons left behind were turned out by a Keraḷa or Travancore ruler Ravivarma Kulaśēkhara. In the years following the death of Alauddin Khilji, his son Mubarak constituted the Muhammadan Province of the Dakhan with the capital Dēvagiri, the modern Daulatabad. When after a revolution Muhammad Tughlak ascended the throne a conquest of the South was attempted with so much success that a Muhammadan Governorship of Ma'abar (the Coromandel Coast) was formed with Madura for its headquarters. This distant Governorship was among the earliest to revolt and set up independently. When Muhammad had involved himself in the hopeless muddle of subduing the

ever recurring revolt of his provinces, the Hoysala ruler began gradually consolidating his power by planting a series of garrisons along the Krishna as a first line of defence, with a second and a third line behind it. Penugoṇḍa was the main fortress in the second line covering the whole of the South country below the Ghats, Carnatic Payin Ghat as the Muhammadans called it. It was this movement on the part of the last great Hoysala monarch which culminated in the foundation of the Empire of Vijayanagar, and the foundation of the fortress preceded by a few years this imperial foundation.

The village of Hampi on the banks of the Tungabhadra with its shrine sacred to Virūpākṣa had probably a long anterior reputation as a holy place, and set over against Ānegoṇḍi on the other side of the river offered advantages considerably superior to the fortress of Kampli two miles and a half down the river which had suffered badly during the recent wars. The destruction of Kampli, the foundation of the fortress which afterwards became Vijayanagar, and the shifting of the Hoysala royal residence all came so close together about A. D. 1328 that they seem to have had some kind of organic connection as the outward acts of an accepted course of policy, followed as it was by a more vigorous effort of Muhammad to conquer the South. This resulted in success, but so short-lived as to lead on to the declaration of independence of Ma'abar in A.D. 1335, and the establishment of the Sultanate of Madura which lasted, with a break of about twelve years (A.D. 1345-1358), till A.D. 1378 or thereabouts. This posture of affairs explains the importance of Penugoṇḍa, as a strongly fortified place in the direct line of communication between the provinces

of Dēvagiri and Ma'abar. Hence this was made the headquarters of a province and made over to the charge first of General Māchayya, and transferred subsequently to Bukka who placed one of his :brothers and then one of his sons in charge of it. After the wars of the Hoysalas against the Sultans of Madura, Penugoṇḍa became a place of comparatively minor importance, and continued as the headquarters of a province. With the rise of the usurper Śāḷuva Narasinga and the aggressive activity of Muhammad, the last Bahmani Sultan and the Gajapati of Orissa, Penugoṇḍa again became important as the Key of the South. Under the usurpation it marked the limit of partition between the imperial territories and those of the rising Śāḷuva usurper, who kept the whole of the empire well in hand. Either under him or in the years immediately following Penugoṇḍa rose into greater importance, and was one of the subordinate governments not reduced to allegiance when the great emperor Krishṇa came to the throne. It was at that time in the possession of the Mysore chief Gangarāja of Ummattūr who enjoyed the title of *Chikkarāya* or Prince. Krishṇa's first war was against him. The reduction of this recalcitrant viceroy to subordination brought the whole of Mysore and the central block of territory next adjoining on the east of it as far as Vellore. Penugoṇḍa does not figure prominently in the history of the empire after this till the battle of Talikota in A.D. 1565 when a combination of the four chief Mussalman states of the Dakhan overthrew the imperial forces in a disastrous battle. The evacuation of Vijayanagar after this event brings Penugoṇḍa to prominence as the royal residence of the emperors.

The battle of Talikota, according to Caesar Frederick, went against Vijayanagar chiefly through the treachery of two Muhammadan generals of Vijayanagar, each of whom had an army of seventy thousand under him. The eldest of the three brothers fell in battle and the fate of the youngest was probably the same, though it seems likely he survived. The second brother Tirumala succeeded to the Government of his elder brother, the titular emperor Sadāśiva continuing to be the nominal ruler as before. According to the same traveller who was in Vijayanagar two years after the battle, the town remained standing. The defeat itself was not very destructive to the armies of the Hindu Empire, and Tirumala is nowhere indicated as a coward. He was able to fall back upon Penugoṇḍa in quite a leisurely progress and was able to carry with him about 350 elephant-loads of treasure. All this is not the work of a disheartened craven acting under the influence of fear of the further advance of the Muhammadans. He seems to have been led to take this step out of fear of the nearer foe, the two Muhammadan divisions of the Vijayanagar army and their generals. Even such of the loyal Muhammadans who followed him he seems to have cantoned outside Penugoṇḍa and on the side of it which was not open to attack. A village about four or five miles to the west of Penugoṇḍa goes by the name *Turukkāḷpaṭnam* (the city of the Muhammadans). From this time onwards Penugoṇḍa became the Hindu Capital and consequently the objective of all attack by the forces of Golkoṇḍa and Bijapur. In the years following the battle of Talikota, the Mughal armies of Akbar moved across the mountain barrier and penetrated into the Dakhan, and thus diverted

the attention of the northern states of Ahmadnagar and Berar. Vijayanagar was left to be dismembered by the two southern States, and this they constantly attempted to do till their own turn came for being attacked by the Mughals from the north. All this aggressive activity of Golkoṇḍa and Bijapur, Tirumala managed to keep within bounds during his life-time. It was probably with a view to this that he brought about a division of the responsibilities among his three sons at the time of his death. He left the empire to his eldest son Śrīranga with his headquarters at Penugoṇḍa. He gave the southern provinces to his youngest son Venkaṭa, with his headquarters at Chandragiri. The second son Rāma had for his share the Viceroyalty of Seringapatam and the whole of the present-day territory of Mysore. This division was necessitated by the understanding arrived at between Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa, the former having the territory above the Ghats to conquer and annex, and the latter the territory below the Ghats.

This division of the Empire in 1575 or 1576 made Penugoṇḍa the objective upon which Golkoṇḍa concentrated her attacks. These were so frequent and persistent that as a result of a siege following a repulse in 1577, the emperor himself became a prisoner. Ibrahim Kuṭub Shah on this occasion received the active assistance of the Hande Nāyaka of Anantapur. He was released however as the result of a treaty and continued to maintain himself against Golkoṇḍa mostly by diplomacy and not altogether without war. When Śrīranga died in 1585, Golkoṇḍa had advanced her possessions almost to the Peṇṇār. Rāma died before Śrīranga leaving two

young sons who were at the imperial headquarters, Seringapatam being governed by deputies. Venkaṭa as the surviving brother succeeded to the United Empire on the death of Śrīranga. With the accession of the new ruler there was a renewal of Golkoṇḍa aggressions. Venkaṭa had to be active against the ambitions of his viceroys, particularly those of Madura on the one side, and the activities of Golkoṇḍa on the north and those of Bijapur against the viceroyalty of Seringapatam. Venkaṭa provided against the last by appointing Jagadēva Rāyal to the Government of Channapaṭna and the Baramahals as a barrier against the advance of Bijapur. He managed to keep Madura in allegiance by sending an army to co-operate with the Nāyaka of Tanjore who had already given evidence of unswerving loyalty on a previous occasion. This imperial contingent was sent in charge of his nephew, who showed himself ready to make common cause with his enemies. When he was baulked in this effort he retired to his father's viceroyalty of Seringapatam where he continued in practical independence of his uncle, the emperor. There was a Golkoṇḍa invasion of Penugoṇḍa, ending in a siege of the capital, which was raised by the active exertions of Jagadēva Rāyal, the Viceroy of Channapaṭna about the year 1589. The empire continued to maintain itself with success against its enemies, both within and without, when about A.D. 1610, there was another siege of Penugoṇḍa by the whole forces of Golkoṇḍa. Advantage was taken of this adversity to the emperor, and the coolness between the emperor and his nephew Viceroy of Seringapatam by Rāja Woḍēyār of Mysore. The latter laid siege to Seringapatam and took possession of it.

Venkaṭa had apparently to stand a long siege and the siege was raised by the arrival of the Tanjore forces under the command of the young Prince Raghunātha, the heir-apparent. Venkaṭa confirmed by a charter the possession of the Seringapatam viceroyalty by Rāja Woḍēyār in 1612, and died two years later without leaving a son to succeed him.

Venkaṭa had at least five queens; none of them seems to have had a son, at any rate acknowledged of Venkaṭa. One of them, daughter of the Gobbūri chief, brought up a boy as her child. Venkaṭa apparently did not take him as such, but took no steps to put a stop to the pretensions of the mother in favour of her putative son. Venkaṭa seems to have designed as his successor his nephew Śrīranga, the brother of the Viceroy at Seringapatam, who remained at court and enjoyed the title *Chikkarāya*, the title of the heir-apparent. Thus Śrīranga was nominated emperor on the death of Venkaṭa, and this set up the supporters of the putative son against him. The chief of these was the boy's uncle apparently, Gobbūri Jaggarāya, as he is called. All the discontented elements in the empire joined him, and he managed to take possession of Penugoṇḍa and throw Śrīranga, his queen and five children, three boys and two girls, into prison. One loyal officer at the head of his forces remained hanging out devising means to save his master, or at least one of his sons. Jagga perpetrated a horrid massacre of the prisoner king, and his wife and children, but before this could be done, the loyalist Yāchama managed to get possession of the second son, Rāma by name, a lad of ten or twelve years. Yāchama fled with the prince to Tanjore, and this made the empire fall into two camps. Tanjore alone took up the cause of the prince.

All the other chiefs with even a Portuguese contingent ranged themselves against the prince and Tanjore. Mysore remained aloof. Tanjore won a victory against the formidable combination near Trichinopoly, and anointed Prince Rāma in the empire at Kumbhakonam. Rāma seems to have ruled from Penugoṇḍa which, through the Civil War and the consequent neglect of the northern front, became gradually untenable. Golkoṇḍa was gradually fastening her grip over the territory in the vicinity. With the advent of Mir Jumla to the counsels of Golkoṇḍa a more vigorous policy became discernible, and Venkaṭa II in the last years of his reign felt compelled to fall back upon Chandragiri. A record of this ruler of date A.D. 1638 is practically the last Vijayanagar inscription in Penugoṇḍa. It records the restoration of certain villages, granted to the Babayya Daraga on the hill next the tank, by Vīra Narasinga, the elder brother of Krishṇa, Sadāśiva and Venkaṭa I. The tomb of this Muhammadan saint is on the top of the hill called Babayyanbetta, Īraṇṇangiri as it is called popularly. Near the foot of the hill is the tomb of Tirumalarāya and his hunter-dog.

About A.D. 1640 Penugoṇḍa fell into the hands of the Muhammadans of Golkoṇḍa. When Golkoṇḍa fell, it passed under the government of various Muhammadan generals, from one of whom it passed into the hands of the Mahrattas. Ḥaidar Āli took possession of it from them about A.D. 1772 from whom it passed to the Nizam first, and then to the British along with the Ceded Districts in the arrangement consequent upon the fall of Seringapatam and the abolition of Muhammadan rule in Mysore.

Mysore under the Wodeyars

This Chapter is an historical outline of the origin and growth of the State of Mysore under the present dynasty up to the time of Ḥaidar Āli. This period of the history* of Mysore is hardly touched at all in any history except in that by Colonel Wilks, who was not in possession of the historical material now available to the student of history. The errors he has fallen into are rather serious but quite excusable in one who wrote so early in the century as he did, and who obtained all the information then possible. The publication of the volumes of inscriptions in Mysore by Mr. Rice is likely to throw a flood of light upon Mysore history and that of some other contemporary kingdoms. This and the lately published works of Minister Tirumala Aiyangar are the main authorities on which this paper rests for its information. The history of Mysore in Kannaḍa prose compiled at the direction of his late Highness, though not of much value as an historical composition, is still of use as supplying fuller information on what is

---

* I refer to two works—The *Palace History* and Wilks' *History.*

The *Palace History* is a Canarese compilation from the *Vamśāvaḷi* and other MS records in the palace. It was compiled at the instance of His late lamented Highness Śrī Chāmarājēndra Woḍēyār. It is based on traditions of a more or less reliable character.

The Historical Sketches of South India by Wilks is referred to in the Chapter as Wilks' *History.*

otherwise found to be the truth. It is not as an authoritative composition that I write this Chapter on Mysore. It is only a small contribution, which may eventually lead to the writing of a good history of Mysore, of which this is but an imperfect sketch of a period covering nearly two centuries.

In the epoch making battle of Talikota in which the Mussalmans and the Hindus contended for supremacy in southern India, and which ended in the complete victory of the Muhammadan coalition, the emperor Rāmarāja the last real one, fell. His only surviving brother Hiri Timmarāja fled with the wreck of the army to Vijayanagar, and finding it impossible to sustain himself any longer there against the conquerors, he shifted his capital to *Ghanagiri* (Penukoṇḍa). Here he died leaving three sons, Śrīranga Rāyal, Rāmarāja, and Venkaṭapatirāya. The division of the empire was made during the father's life-time in accordance with which, Śrīranga Rāyal ruled from Penukoṇḍa, nominally at least, the whole of the Telugu country; Rāmarāja had for his share the Kannaḍa country with his capital at Śrīrangapaṭna; Venkaṭapatirāya ruled from Chandragiri* over the largest portion as would appear, namely, over the Toṇḍa, Chōḷa, and Pāṇḍya *Maṇḍalams.* But that this rule was anything more than nominal is matter for doubt as will appear from the sequel. As it was, however, the Vijayanagar empire extended from the banks of the northern Peṇṇār, if not the Tungabhadra to Cape Comorin, and was divided in 1597 into the viceroyalties of Penugoṇḍa, Ginjee, Tanjore, Madura,

* *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, pp. 1–16.

Channapaṭna, and Śrīrangapaṭna, the first one and perhaps nominally the whole under Śrīranga Rāyal, the next three under Venkaṭapatirāya, and the last two under Rāmarāja.*

About this time, Śrīranga Rāyal died without issue, and Rāmarāja also followed leaving Tirumalarāya his son, a minor; so that the whole empire devolved upon Venkaṭapatirāya. Tirumalarāya lived with his uncle, leaving at Śrīrangapaṭna as vice-regent *Remati*, *Revati*, or *Timati* Venkaṭa the general of Rāmarāja. The viceroys, aware of the weakness of the central authority, bore the yoke rather lightly and waited for an opportunity to shake off the yokes, when an incident happened to accelerate the natural tendencies to disruption. This incident is reported by Tirumala Aiyangar, who lived in the latter half of the seventeenth and the earlier half of the eighteenth centuries, occupying all along a commanding position in the courts of successive rulers of Mysore, as follows: 'The Madura Nāik revolted and Venkaṭapatirāya sent his nephew (probably now a major) to put down the revolt. Instead of doing this, his plain duty, Tirumalarāya received bribes from the rebellious satrap and marched with all his army to Śrīrangapaṭna, thereby bringing on himself a deserved retribution and showing to onlookers the hollowness of the empire.'† It was under these circumstances that there arose a particularly clever ruler in Mysore, who turned them all to his advantage and laid the foundation of the present Mysore State.

---

* Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, p. 59.

† *Chikka Dēvarāja Vijayam* 2nd Canto; *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, pp. 1–16.

We shall now proceed to inquire who this personage was and what his position. There seems to have been in use in the territory of Mysore (and even outside it) ever since the dawn of history the designation of *Woḍēyārs* signifying a certain feudal status. What the amount of the land was, the possession of which gave this honorific title to the possessor, is very hard to determine now. There have been Woḍēyārs whose possessions varied from a village or two to thirty or forty. The Woḍēyār of Karoogahally* owns himself master of only one village; and Rāja Woḍēyār of Mysore about the same time was lord of twenty-three villages.† But the term Woḍēyār is also largely used in another sense being merely equivalent to 'lord'. This is the term used in addressing priests among the Lingayats. It may be a combination of both when applied to the members of the ruling family. But Yadu Rāya is said to have been requested by his wife to assume this title as a mark of gratitude to a Lingayat priest who helped him in taking possession of Mysore from the usurper *Daḷavāi* Māra-nāyaka.‡ Whatever may be the value of this story, the title seems to have retained both the above meanings as applied to the Mysore family.

This family traces its descent from a certain Yadu Rāya who is believed to have reigned from 1399 to 1423. He is said to have come to this province from Dvāraka.

---

* *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, p. 16.

† Thirty-three villages according to Wilks (*vide* Vol. i, p. 21, footnote).

‡ *Palace History*, p. 16.

The object of his journey to Mysore with his brother Krishṇa is differently given by different authorities; some giving the worship of god Nārāyaṇa of Mēlukōṭe as the object, and others that of the goddess Chāmuṇḍi of the Mysore Hill. Whatever the motive of these brothers, they appear to have been fugitive princes of the lately overthrown Hoysala family which had its capital at *Dvāravati* (the modern Haḷebid), or of that of the Kākatīyas of Warangal which claimed to bolong to the Chandra Vamśa as well.* But Wilks mentions them as Yādava fugitives from the court of Vijayanagar, which seems very likely. They came to Mysore where circumstances favoured their founding a family. Here again accounts differ, but the one given in the *Palace History* looks more probable than that of Wilks. A certain Chāmarāja Woḍēyār of Mysore died leaving behind him his widow and an only daughter. The *Daḷavāi* Māranāyaka assumed the regency which he tried eventually to convert into royalty. The widow and her daughter seem to have been helpless in his hands.† Perhaps, he would have married the daughter and thus given an appearance of legality to his usurpation; but his unpopularity and the discontent among his officers came to a head in a conspiracy against him. The palace party seems to have had the sympathy of the people and the conspiracy against the usurper had gained in strength, when Yadu Rāya was ready to play his part by heading the conspiracy.

* This view seems to receive support from the author of copper plate No. 64 of Śrīrangapaṭna.

Vide p. 23 Translation.

Epigraphia Carnataka, Vol. i, Part I.

† *Palace History*, p. 9, *et seq.*

Success attendig the conspiracy, Yadu won the hand of the Woḍēyār's daughter, and he succeded to her father's estate as was agreed to before. It was a 'jungam' priest who negotiated the treaty, and hence the title Woḍēyār attached to the princes of the family as mentioned above.

This is the historical founder of the family, and he ruled over Mysore town and a few villages about it. What the actual extent of this small State was we have no means of ascertaining now. He settled upon his brother an estate, which he took from one of his father-in-law's relatives, and died in 1423.

His son Hiri Beṭad Chāmarāja Woḍēyār succeeded him in 1423. Nothing is known of this personage except his name. He was in turn succeeded by his son Timmarāja Woḍēyār in the year 1458. His son Hiri Chāmarāja Woḍēyār ascended the throne of the little kingdom, if we may call it a kingdom at all, in the year 1478. This ruler's son was Beṭad Chāmarāja * whose reign began in the year 1513, and it is this person who has the honour of being mentioned in the inscriptions and copper-plates next to Yadu, the intervening names being omitted. Beṭad Chāmarāja is credited by the *Palace History* with having constructed a big tank in Mysore, and by Wilks with having repaired the fort of Mysore 'till then known as *Puragērī*† He is also said by the same authority to have removed the capital to Mysore, probably from Hadana, the place conquered by Yadu. This account, of course, differs from what is stated above. All :the authorities referred to agree in giving this person three sons, Timmarāja, Krishṇa-

* *Vide* Śrīrangapaṭna, 64, 100 and others (*Epi. Car.*).

† Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, p. 22.

rāja, and Chāmarāja 'the bald'. During his life-time, he arranged, according to custom, to settle Hēmanalli upon Timmarāja, and Kembala upon Krishṇarāja. Timmarāja was however, to succeed his father,* Chāmarāja 'the bald', ruling after him. This is probably what is referred to by Wilks as the partition of the estate. But it is better to regard it as a settlement only, since all the other parties appear to have been subject to the ruler at Mysore. This is borne out by the settlement made at his death by Rāja Woḍēyār. Before leaving Beṭad Chāmarāja, † it ought to be mentioned that this was the person who is regarded as having, by his prowess, earned the title of '*Birudantembaraganḍa*' (the man of those who say they are so and so) mentioned in the inscriptions.

This ruler was succeeded in 1552 by his son Timmarāja according to the testament of his father. Timmarāja is reputed to have acquired the undoubted and sole right to the title of '*Birudantembaraganḍa*' by defeating other Woḍēyārs who laid claim to it likewise during a visit to Nanjanagūḍu. He followed up this victory by the conquest of Ummattūr and Sinduvalli.‡ During his time, Mysore territory must have been very small in extent, as he had to get permission from other independent Woḍēyārs to pass through their territory to Nanjanagūḍu.

This ruler was succeeded by his youngest brother *Bōle*§ Chāmarāja or Chāmarāja 'the bald'. This was no

---

* *Palace History*, pp. 18 and 99.

† *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, p. 56, *et seq.*

‡ Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, p. 22; *Palace History*, p. 19.

§ Hiri Chāmarāja of Wilks and Doḍḍa Chāmarāja of Śrīrangapaṭna, 157. Page 36, Translation (*Epi. Car.*).

doubt the wish of the father, but why his elder brother Krishṇarāja was passed over is not quite clear. Can it be that he died before 1571? This Chāmarāja then ruled for five years 1571–6, and is credited by Wilks wtth having evaded the tribute due to the viceroy at Śrīrangapaṭna.* It is now not ten years after the battle of Talikota which took place in 1565. The viceroy is said to have besieged the fort of Mysore, and it is recorded that his *Daḷavāi*,† Rēvati, Rēmati, or Timati Venkaṭa, was defeated and forced to cede Kottagala. This shows the want of efficiency in the viceregal government.

About this time, also, Akbar had made himself almost master of Hindustan, and was turning his attention to the southern side of the Vindhyas. This new element of disturbance, and the resistance which it provoked in the Mussalman Powers of the Dakhan, gave to the further south comparative peace, even the Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa princes having had to divide their attention. It was only the imbecility of the Vijayanagar rulers that gave these petty Woḍēyārs an opportunity for rising to greatness. Rāmarāja, the viceroy, was dead leaving behind him the minor Tirumalarāya mentioned above, whose treason cost him his viceroyalty.

Bōḷe Chāmarāja left at his death four sons, Rājādhirāja, Beṭad Chāmarāja, Muppim Dēvarāja and Chāmarāja.‡ Here there is a disagreement among the authorities

* *History*, Vol. i, pp. 12-13.

† *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, p. 45, *et seq.* Śrīrangapaṭna 64 and others.

‡ *Vide* Genealogical Table No. 3.

which appears hard to reconcile. There is a confusion in Wilks' *History* between Beṭad Woḍēyār, Timmarāja's son, and Beṭad Chāmarāja Woḍēyār, Bōḷe Chāmarāja's son. Wilks makes Raja Woḍēyār, the son of Timmarāja, in opposition to all the other authorities. He is evidently wrong, as there is an inscription,* dated 1614 (Rāja Woḍēyār died in 1617), which represents him as the son of Doḍḍa Chāmarāja Woḍēyār of Mysore. But before going to Rāja Woḍēyār, we have to dispose of a Beṭad Chāmarāja Woḍēyār, who ruled for two years (1576–8). The *Palace History* makes him the eldest son of Chāmarāja 'the bald'. But the inscriptions and other works referred to, make him the younger brother of Rāja Woḍēyār. Wilks,† on the other hand, makes the successor of Bōḷe Chāmarāja, a Beṭad Woḍēyār, his nephew. He seems to be in the right, because the inscriptions and the works of Tirumala Aiyangar, above referred to, make no mention of this ruler. Besides, since both the cousins bore nearly the same name there is room for confusion, and the short duration of the rule of Beṭad Woḍēyār has a suspicious air of forced abdication rather than of voluntary retirement. The idea of a younger brother superseding the elder to get over financial embarrassment, or of the compulsory retirement of the latter by the elders of the land, seems not to be very common in the traditions of Indian rulers. The father Timmarāja having ruled, Beṭad Woḍēyār naturally wished to succeed him, but his uncle came in the way with the authority of the testament above mentioned. At his uncle's death, he succeeded in the absence of a previous arrangement,

* Śrīrangapaṭna, p. 36. Translation (*Epi. Car.*).

† Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, p. 21.

and was probably persuaded to retire in favour of his cousin Rāja Woḍēyār on the ground of the settlement of Hēmanalli upon his father, Mysore falling to the lot of Chāmarāja 'the bald.'* According to Wilks, there is nothing strange in Beṭad Woḍēyār's quiet retirement, or in his accepting the office of *Daḷavāi* under Rāja Woḍēyār. There is nothing worthy of mention in this reign of two years.†

In 1578, there came to the throne of Mysore a ruler, at once capable and politic, who laid the foundations of its greatness and consolidated, to a certain extent, the disintegrating viceroyalty of Śrīrangapaṭna; this was Rāja Woḍēyār who, for reasons given above, may be considered the eldest son of Bōḷe Chāmarāja of Mysore. The minority of Tirumalarāya of Śrīrangapaṭna gave ample scope to the aggrandizement of the Woḍēyārs generally,‡ and Rāja Woḍēyār benefited most of all. A glance at the lists of his conquests shows that there were many powerful Woḍēyārs along with him under the nominal suzerainty of the viceroy at Śrīrangapaṭna. These Woḍēyārs can be roughly divided into two classes with respect to Rāja Woḍēyār. Many of them were connected with him by marriages or otherwise; while there were others who, having suffered at his hands, kept aloof from him and intrigued at the viceroy's court. To the former class belonged the Woḍēyārs of Kaḷale, Biḷuguḷa, Biḷikere, Hura, Hullanahalli, Mūgur, etc. To the latter class belonged the Woḍēyārs of Ammachāvaḍi,

* *Vide* Genealogical Tables i and iv.

† *Palace History*, pp. 474–8.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 22–3; Wilks' *History*, p. 28.

Kanniambāḍi, Talakāḍ, Karoogahalli, etc.* Each member of these two classes seems to have been independent and did not always look up to the viceroy for help, as is evidenced by the alliances and treaties entered into independently. Each one seems to have thought only of making what use the name and prestige of the viceroy could afford him. At the commencement of his reign, Rāja Woḍēyār is said to have been master of twenty-three and a half 'townships' † with a revenue of three thousand *honnus* (a *honnu* is a rupee and a half). This territory was divided among 300 *jāgīrdārs*, each with a headquarter town of his own. The principal sources of revenue were taxes derived from this estate, plunder got from war, and tributes paid by other Woḍēyārs. With these means at his disposal, he seems to have been a troublesome neighbour, first attacking the Woḍēyārs of the Channapaṭna viceroyalty, and latterly under some pretext or other those of Śrīrangapaṭna itself. For all the conquests thus made, he appears to have sought the authority, at least after conquest, of his suzerain. But the suzerainty was at this time divided between the traitorous Tirumalarāya and his uncle Venkaṭapatirāya. Rāja Woḍēyār, in his aggressive conduct against the viceroy of Śrīrangapaṭna, received the moral support of Venkaṭapatirāya, the nominal ruler of the Vijayanagar empire. Venkaṭapatirāya about this time, made a number of grants to Rāja Woḍēyār which appear to have been conquests rather than grants.‡ This growth of power and territory

* *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, pp. 15–26.

† *Ibid.*, p. 26, *et seq.*

‡ Śrīrangapaṭna 157. Tirumakuḍlu Narasipura 116. Compare *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, pp. 17–20.

Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi, pp. 17 and 20; Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, p. 25.

of the Woḍēyār naturally alarmed the viceroy at Śrīranga-paṭna, who tried to bring about the death of Rāja Woḍēyār. War was thought of, but stratagems were voted better by his vassal councillors. A general muster of the viceregal army was ordered under pretence of a review for the Dussarah, and Rāja Woḍēyār was invited to pay a friendly visit. Rāja Woḍēyār, in his turn, and on the advice of his brothers, Beṭad Chāmarāja and Dēvarāja, assembled his army, having been previously informed by his spies of the real state of feeling at Śrīrangapaṭna. He thought it better, however, to leave the army under Beṭad Chāmarāja and paid his visit to the viceroy with his brother Dēvarāja and a faithful body of followers.* The viceroy received him with apparent cordiality, having previously arranged an ambuscade to take Rāja Woḍēyār prisoner while going out for a ride. But, luckily for Rāja Woḍēyār, a petty incident thwarted the project. As soon as Tirumalarāya turned his back on Rāja Woḍēyār's quarters after his visit, the Woḍēyār's attendants began, as usual on all public occasions, to repeat his titles, among them '*Birudantembaragaṇḍa*' so fruitful of quarrels in Mysore history. Tirumalarāya sent word that this one of all the titles might be given up by both parties, as neither of them could lay claim to it as a hereditary title. This was resented. Rāja Woḍēyār with his faithful retainers marched through the army of the viceroy which was described as follows: 'The contingents of Baḷḷapur Koḷatala, Bangalore, Magadi, Punganoor and other Morasa countries were twenty elephants, two thousand horse, twenty thousand foot; of Talakāḍ, Yelandur, Ammachāvaḍi, Tirukaṇāmbi and other

* *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, p. 33, *et seq.*

interior *nāḍs* (states), ten elephants, five hundred horse, ten thousand foot; of Kaḷale, Belur, Keḷadi, and other *Malnāḍs* (hill-states), twenty elephants, two thousand horse, twenty thousand foot; of Chintanakal, Chikkanāyakanahalli, Banavara, Basavāpatna, Sira and other Beḍar *nāḍs* (hunter states), five elephants, five hundred horse, ten thousand foot.' Rāna Jagadēva Rāyal, Kereyoor Timma Nāika and other '*Ravuta Payakas*' (cavalry and infantry officers) supplied contingent of fifteen elephants, four thousand horse, twenty-four thousand foot. With the reserve force of thirty elephants, three thousand horse, thirty thousand foot, the total runs up to a hundred elephants, twelve thousand horse and one hundred and fourteen thousand foot.* This is really Napoleonic indeed for an army that was defeated by Rāja Woḍēyār! It is not probable that these were the actual numbers in the field; but the above computation shows the miscellaneous composition of the army, and what little common interest they could have had in fighting for the viceroy. The viceroy resolved after due deliberation to lay siege to the fort of Kesaregoṇṭe and not, as originally proposed, to Mysore. The first seems to have been, at the time, unfit for standing a siege. It was situated between Śrīrangapaṭna and Mysore. Beṭad Chāmarāja Woḍēyār held out till a relieving force approached from Mysore, and the miscellaneous viceregal army was then put to flight easily. Tirumalarāya, the viceroy, was already meditating flight from Śrīrangapaṭna,

* *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, pp. 26-33.

In the States depending on Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa were maintained 200,000 horse.

Footnote 2 at p. 58 Vol. i of Wilks' *History*.

when some of the Woḍēyārs who had formerly counselled the advance of the army, now persuaded him to stand a siege, and encamped with their forces on the northern side of the fort. These were again defeated by Narasarāja, the eldest son of Rāja Woḍēyār, and Tirumalrāya now fled to Talakāḍ leaving his family behind.* This event is generally regarded as having taken place in 1610. But it is recorded that Rāja Woḍēyār received Śrīrangapaṭna as a grant from Venkaṭapatirāya in 1612.† It would thus appear that Rāja Woḍēyār obtained the sanction of Venkaṭapatirāya for keeping possession of what he actually conquered. On the flight of Tirumalarāya, the treatment accorded by Rāja Woḍēyār to the wife of the ex-viceroy is variously related. According to Tirumala Aiyangar‡, Rāja Woḍēyār pointed out to her the desirability of accompanying her husband and provided her with an escort to go to Talakāḍ, and this authority calls her Śrīranganāyaki. But the *Palace History* (pp. 31-2), gives a different version which appears to be nearer to the truth. The lady is named Alamēlumangā, and she went to Mālangi after her husband. Rāja Woḍēyār, at the instance of the priest of Ranganāyaki, the goddess, sent for some jewels belonging to the goddess in the possession of the viceroy's wife at the time, with a threat that the jewels would be taken from her by force if she did not surrender them at once. She refused to surrender them all on the score that they were her own, though she very often lent them for the decoration of the

* Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, p. 26.

† Tirumakuḍlu Narasipura 62 (A.D. 1622, actual date Śaka year 1534, the year of cycle Parīdāvi).

‡ *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, pp. 31-2.

goddess. Having said this, and being afraid of her own safety, she drowned herself in a well at Mālangi. But the popular tradition is that Rāja Woḍēyār hounded her to death for the sake of her jewels and perhaps of her person too. She is said to have pronounced a curse at her death which may be rendered as follows: May Mālangi be no more than a tank; may Talakāḍ be buried under sand; may the Rāja of Mysore have no issue left.' And Rāja Woḍēyār is believed to have lost all his four grown-up sons on account of this. It is customary even now in the royal family to perform an expiatory ceremony on the ninth day of the Dussarah to appease the angry spirit of this injured lady. From this custom it would appear that, whatever may have been the cause of her death, Rāja Woḍēyār, in having arranged for this ceremony, thought himself responsible for her tragic end. Thus was Śrīrangapaṭna mastered once and for all; but Rāja Woḍēyār, in spite of the grant of Venkaṭapatirāya in 1612, did not assume full sovereignty. In all the inscriptions* of his and of his grandson's reigns, the Vijayanagar emperor is introduced as the ruling sovereign, the grants being made in his time. The first inscription, in which this kind of introduction is dispensed with, is one dated 1646, during the reign of Kanṭhīrava Narasarāja Woḍēyār,† while another of the first year of this ruler duly acknowledges the suzerainty of the Vijayanagar ruler.

On the overthrow of the viceroy at Śrīrangapaṭna Rāja Woḍēyār received an ambassador,‡ named Gambhīra Rāja

---

* Śrīrangapaṭna 103, pp. 29–30, Translation (*Epi. Car.*).

† Nanjanagūḍu 198, pp. 115–6, Translation (*Epi. Car.*).

‡ *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, pp. 55–6.

Virūpaṇṇa, from Venkaṭapatirāya, who conveyed his master's congratulations to the Rāja Woḍēyār on his victory over the viceroy. Rāja Woḍēyār was probably then appointed by the emperor to succeed Tirumalarāya, thus making the appointment a virtue of necessity. Rāja Woḍēyār then ruled for a period of five or six years, nominally as viceroy, but actually as sovereign in his territory, which, with the additions he made to it, embraced nearly the whole of the present Mysore district and a part of Hassan.

But before closing his history, a word must be said as to his administration. He appears to have been careful to take the actual administration of the conquered territories into his own hands and to appoint his own officers. He is also reputed to have celebrated the Dussarah festival on a grand scale and made the rule that, in future, the death even of the closest relatives of the royal family should not interfere with the festivities. This question had to be discussed by experts in his reign on account of the death of his eldest son Narasarāja. The appointment of a *Daḷavāi* discontinued ever since the usurpation of Māranāyaka, was now revived owing, as Rāja Woḍēyār is made to say, to the vast additions to his estates. The first appointment was unsatisfactory, as indeed many of them were throughout. The first *Daḷavāi* under the present dynasty was Rāja Woḍēyār's nephew, Karikāla Mallarājayya of Kaḷale, of the same family as the *Daḷavāi* brothers, who brought about the downfall of the ruling dynasty and the rise of Ḥaidar Āli. Mallarājayya resigned shortly after his appointment and was succeeded by Beṭad Woḍēyār.* This Beṭad

* *Palace History*, p. 45.

Woḍēyār must have been the same as Rāja Woḍēyār's cousin who was superseded by him. This act of trust on the part of the latter flattered the feelings of the former who had quietly abdicated the royal position. Previous to the appointment of a *Daḷavāi*, Rāja Woḍēyār's army appears to have been uniformly led by his brother Beṭad Chāmarāja Woḍēyār; and, therefore, he could not have been the new *Daḷavāi*. Rāja Woḍēyār, by this time, had lost all the four of his grown-up sons and his youngest brother Chāmarāja. He settled the succession, therefore, in consultation with his two surviving younger brothers, Beṭad Chāmarāja and Dēvarāja, on Chāmarāja Woḍēyār, his grandson by Narasarāja. He is said by some authorities to have left to the infant Immaḍirāja the *jāgīr* of West Daṇṇāyakanakōṭe,* but Immaḍirāja is generally regarded a posthumous son. The sons of Beṭad Chāmarāja and Dēvarāja received the *jāgīrs*, Rangasamudra and Nullur Vijayapura and Arikere and Yelandūrumangala respectively.† Having made these settlements he retired with his brothers to Melkōṭē where he died in 1617.

Rāja Woḍēyār accordingly was succeeded by his grandson, Chāmarāja Woḍēyār, who ruled from 1617 to 1637. It has been mentioned that, under Rāja Woḍēyār, the office of *Daḷavāi* was revived to meet the exigencies of increased territory and administration. This office combined in itself the offices of Prime Minister and Commander-in-Chief. At the accession of Chāmarāja Woḍēyār Beṭad

---

* *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, p. 57, *et seq.*

† Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, p. 39. *Palace History*, p. 49, makes Rāja Woḍēyār prophesy the birth of a male child to his pregnant wife.

Woḍēyār held this important office and exercised his authority not so much as the *Daḷavāi*, but as guardian to the young Rāja. The Rāja and the *Daḷavāi* very soon fell out on a small matter, the one having been as tenacious of his authority as the other of his dignity. Beṭad Woḍēyār, it would appear, dismissed a few servants near the person of the Rāja who were found to be abusing the trust. This was resented and consequently an attempt was made by Beṭad, Woḍēyār's son, to poison the Rāja. Beṭad Woḍēyār fled for his life which was granted him at the cost of his eyes. The office of *Daḷavāi* always appears to have been unfortunate in Mysore, for the officers were ready to misbehave, whenever the ruler was not strong enough to keep them under control. There were four *Daḷavāis* in this reign, the last of whom was Vikramarāya, the natural son of Beṭad Chāmarāja, brother of Rāja Woḍēyār. Chāmarāja Woḍēyār entrusted the whole administration to the *Daḷavāis* in order to have time enough to discharge his domestic duties.* So long as the *Daḷavāis* were men unconnected with the ruling family, they valued their position too much to intrigue, as was the case with the second and the third *Daḷavāis* of this reign.† These *Daḷavāis*, however, made a number of conquests and annexations and extended Chāmarāja's inheritance in all directions. It is during this reign that the viceroyalty of Jagadēva Rāyal was reduced to nothing by the capture of Channapaṭna and Nāgamangala, and by the siege of Hoskote.‡ It is evident

* In one of the inscriptions Vikramarāya is referred as the natural son of Rāja Woḍēyār.

† Nanjanagūḍu 9, p. 96, Translation (*Epi. Car.*)

‡ *Palace History*, p. 51, Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, p. 29.

that Chāmarāja persevered in carrying on the administration according to the lines laid down by his grandfather by keeping down the Woḍēyārs, by conciliating the ryots and by not increasing the rents.* He is said to have collected a great deal of war material and to have established a depot at Śrīrangapaṭna.† He is also credited with having written a commentary on the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. He died without issue in 1637 and was succeeded by his boy uncle, Immaḍirāja Woḍēyār. *Daḷavāi* Vikramarāya lorded it over the new ruler whom he found to be not nominal one that he would have him, and so he had him poisoned in the year 1638.

Who was to be the next ruler? At the time of Rāja Woḍēyār's death his brother's children were provided with *jāgīrs* as became their dignity. Though nothing is recorded about Dēvarāja, Beṭad Chāmarāja is said to have been living in retirement at Rangasamudra not without exercising a wholesome influence at court. Now that Rāja Woḍēyār's line failed of male issue, people naturally looked up to the children of his next younger brother Beṭad Chāmarāja. From the palace genealogical‡ tree, it appears that Beṭad Chāmarāja had only one son living at the time and that was Kanṭhīrava Narasarāja Woḍēyār. This person cannot have been the mere nominee of Vikramarāya, who was the natural son of Beṭad Chāmarāja, as Beṭad Chāmarāja was himself living, and as Kanṭhīrava Narasa would have suited ill the ambitious

* *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, p. 60, *et seq*.

† *Palace History*, p. 61.

‡ *Vide* Genealogical Table No. 4.

schemes of the *Daḷavāi*. The *Palace History* (p. 65) besides makes Kanṭhīrava Narasa the adopted son of Rāja Woḍēyār, and, as such, he was invited and crowned by one of his widows. The adoption seems likely enough, as Rāja Woḍēyār must have had reasons to fear that the direct line would fail. It must also have been the interest of the palace party not to have a nominee of *Daḷavāi* for the ruler. The subsequent insolent behaviour of the *Daḷavāi* would also support this view. However nominated, Kanṭhīrava Narasa began his rule in A.D. 1638. It is this personage that first made grants in his own name,* even his predecessor Chāmarāja having owned the nominal suzerainty of the phantom ruler at Ghaṇagiri. The first inscription in which an elaborate genealogy of the Mysore rulers alone is given, without reference to the ruler at Penukoṇḍa, is dated A.D. 1646 and is a grant by Kanṭhīrava Narasa.

The reign of Kanṭhīrava Narasa commences the glorious period of the present dynasty, and the three successive rulers, himself and his two successors, may be called the makers of modern Mysore. The first act of this reign is the dismissal from service of *Daḷavāi* Vikramarāya†, and the infliction on him of the condign punishment for his treason against the former ruler. The *Palace History* states that the *Daḷavāi* was punished after due inquiry and confession by himself; but Wilks appears to be right in saying that he was despatched by the hand of the assassin.‡ For the *Daḷavāi* was not only a natural son of Beṭad

---

* Śrīrangapaṭna 103, pp. 29–30 (*Epi. Car.*).

† *Palace History*, p. 67.

‡ Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, p. 31.

Chāmarāja,* but also the first officer in the State. As such, he must have been too powerful and perhaps too popular to be punished like an ordinary servant. This seems to have taught Kanṭhīrava Narasa a good lesson, and we see him throughout his reign making vigorous and rather successful attempts to curb the power of the *Daḷavāis*. so that we see the office changing hands a little too often. This ruler is credited by Wilks with having celebrated the Dussarah festival on a grand scale and for the first time. Whatever the scale of the celebration, he was not the first to celebrate the festival, Rāja Woḍēyār having done it many times during his life.† Kanṭhīrava Narasa, finding it inconvenient to have a number of different coins in circulation, asserted his sovereignty over other Woḍēyārs by establishing a mint and coining in his own name.‡ This is the first step at unifying the loose conglomerate of the petty chieftaincies he inherited, and his coins seem to have had currency in other parts of South India as well, He is also given credit for having made an elaborate survey of the lands under the Woḍēyārs, and, having found the purse-proud ryots too troublesome, he took away all that they had over and above what was necessary for their bare living and occupation.§ This had the desired effect, and not only cowed the refractory Woḍēyārs and other landlords, but enriched Kanṭhīrava Narasa beyond all

---

* *Palace History*, p. 59; Nanjanagūḍu 9, dated 1643, makes him the son of Rāja Woḍēyār.

† *Vide ante*, p. 286.

‡ *Palace History*, p. 34; Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, p. 32.

§ Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, p, 32; *Palace History*, p. 90.

expectation. This act of public plunder was not questioned in those days, as the people had no other means of asserting their rights than that of taking arms against the ruler. This latter measure must clearly have been to their own ruin, for, in the place of one strong master, however unjustifiable his measures, they would have had many more plunderers without the advantage of protection which the former offered. The next step Kanṭhīrava Narasa took was to keep the *Daḷavāis* in check. There were in all ten *Daḷavāis* in this reign, all of whom, excepting one, held the office but for a brief space of time. Under a strong ruler, the *Daḷavāis* had only to play a subordinate part, and, whenever they attempted to make themselves something more, they earned their dismissal. This office, the first in importance in the State, had always been given to a person intimately connected with the ruler either in blood or by association. Whenever the choice fell on relatives, the appointment did not prove happy, as they attempted to assume all power and to turn the attention of the sovereign solely to the enjoyment of home life. Whenever the appointment fell to the lot of some one outside the circle of relations, the choice proved happier, because they had not the same influence in the palace as the others had, and so could be easily dealt with by the ruler. Kanṭhīrava Narasa appears to have made a discovery of this fact, and, therefore, deviated from the principle of choice inaugurated by Rāja Woḍēyār whose *Daḷavāis* were near connexions in blood. Perhaps Rāja Woḍēyār could not as yet have trusted others outside his family, but Kanṭhīrava was much too strong for fear of that kind. So after the fall of his half-brother, *Daḷavāi* Vikramarāya, he appointed

Thimmappa Nāyaka and six others in succession, who were, if at all connected, very distant relatives. Thus we see that Kanṭhīrava Narasa always kept all real power in his own hands, and so did his two successors. Hence the vigour of the administration during the three reigns.

This ruler seems besides to have paid much attention to public works. He rebuilt the forts of Śrīrangapaṭna and Mysore when they got damaged during the siege by Ranadhoola Khān. The details given of these forts are not of much importance. With the money he obtained, as above mentioned, be provided the forts with all that was needful to protect them from assault, and appears to have mounted a large number of guns over the ramparts. He is said to have constructed several tanks, and also the canal which runs over the bridge on the southern arm of the Kāvērī bringing fresh water into the fort. He also made rich endowments to the temples in the province, particularly to those of Śrīranganātha and of god Narasimha at Śrīrangapaṭna. He seems to have commanded armies in person, rather than trust them into the hands of the *Daḷavāis*. He is known to have been very remarkable for his strength and courage, and his first exploit was the defeat of a remarkable prize-fighter in Trichinopoly. Having gone there incognito, he returned, after killing the man, without waiting to receive the prize. This gave rise to one or two unsuccessful conspiracies against his life which may be passsd over here. But the most important military act of the reign was the siege of Śrīrangapaṭna against Ranadhoola Khān, the general of Bijapur.* The siege was brought about as follows: Kanṭhīrava Narasa incited

* Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, p. 31.

Kenge Hanuma of Basavapaṭna and other Woḍēyārs of Ikkēri against their liege lord, Vīrabhadra Nāyaka. The disturbance was promptly quelled by the Ikkēri Nāyaka. Kenge Hanuma went to Bijapur to solicit the aid of the *Padusha* there.* At this time, there was also another fugitive Woḍēyār, Channama of Nāgamangala, lately conquered by Chāmarāja Woḍēyār. The *Padusha* sent his most reputed general, Ranadhoola Khān at the head of an army of forty thousand men to reinstate Kenge Hanuma and to take Śrīrangapaṭna if possible. The general having easily succeeded in doing the first, was very near accomplishing the second as well. Having taken possession of Ikkēri, Sira, and Bangalore on his way, he laid siege to Mysore and Śrīrangapaṭna simultaneously. Besiegers and defenders seem to have fought well, but the loss of the former must have been immense, considering that, even after having effected a breach, they were not able to effect an entry into the fort of Śrīrangapaṭna. They were not more successful in Mysore either; and the double victory is ascribed to divine intervention on behalf of the defenders, thus indicating that the Mysoreans were hopeless of victory in spite of their stubborn defence. Despite this failure to take the forts, Kanṭhīrava Narasa found it impossible, either to stand another siege or to fight his enemy in the open field. So, through the mediation of Kenge Hanuma, a peace was concluded which left to the Mysoreans all the country† south of the Kāvēri, that on the north of the river

* *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, pp. 67-8, *et seq.*
Chikka Dēvarāja Vijayam, 2nd Canto.

† *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, pp. 67-8, *et seq*
Chikka Dēvarāja Vijayam, 2nd Canto.
Palace History, p. 75.

being made over to Bijapur. But the administration of the Bijapur portion was still left in the hands of Kanṭhīrava Narasa himself, on the condition of paying over to Bijapur all the surplus revenue after meeting the cost of administration. This took place in the year of his accession 1638–9. Though Kanṭhīrava Narasa agreed to this treaty in his helplessness, he does not seem to have thought seriously of fulfilling his promise. Ranadhoola Khān, on the other hand, leaving Kenge Hanuma as the Bijapur agent, returned to Bijapur, his headquarters. Vīrabhadra Nāyaka of Ikkēri availed himself of this opportunity to avenge his wrongs on Ranadhoola Khān, and sent an embassy to Bijapur to expose to the *Padusha* the hollowness of the agreement, and the unreliable character of the agent. Ranadhoola Khān was suspected, and a royal commission was sent to inquire into the affairs of Kenge Hanuma, of which Nāgamangla Channaiya was a member. Kenge Hanuma faltered and Kanṭhīrava Narasa grew defiant. To add to this, Channaiya was murdered by Kenge Hanuma, as he was the only member of the commission conversant with the details of the administration.* Ranadhoola Khān was, in consequence, superseded by *Khan-i-Khanan*. This general and his successor, Mustafa Khān, were sent in succession to take possession of Śrīrangapaṭna, the fort of which had been completely rebuilt since the first invasion; but they fared no better than their predecessor. A plundering raid undertaken by Hemaji Pundit of Bijapur and ‘Abdullāh Khān, a general effected nothing of importance except the temporary occupation of Turuvekere. Having thus far been on the

* *Palace History*, pp. 77 and 79.

defensive, Kanṭhīrava Narasa could now take the offensive. In his aggressive march eastward, he defeated the Bijapur forces and took possession of its late conquests. Having defeated the *Vaṇangāmuḍi* Mudaliar of Kongu, he took Samballi, Bomballi, and Satyamangala, having previously worsted the Madura Nāyaka, his liege lord. On the west, he defeated Nanjarāja Woḍēyār of Coorg, and after hunting him from place to place, took possession of Periapatam, his capital, and six other districts (*ghaḍis*).* In the north, he extended his conquests to the frontiers of Ikkēri, Chitaldroog and Sira. After such an eventful reign he died in 1659 leaving no male issue to succeed him.

The descendants of Muppin Dēvarāja, the third brother of Rāja Woḍēyār, came in for their share of rule now. This Dēvarāja had four children, one of whom succeeded Kanṭhīrava Narasa. But, as to which of these four sons succeeded, there is considerable difference of opinion among the authorities. The *Palace History* (p. 91) makes the successor the third son. Wilks † the fourth, and Tirumala Aiyangar, a contemporary, the first. In all the inscriptions of this ruler's and his successor's time, the latter is recorded as the nephew of the former. Tirumala Aiyangar himself makes Doḍḍa Dēvarāja succeed nominally only, while Kempa Dēvaiya, his third brother, was carrying on the administration in fact ‡. The truth appears to be, that Kempa

* *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, pp. 68, *et seq.*; Wilks' *History* Vol. i, pp. 33-5; *Palace History*, pp. 67 and 69.

† Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, pp. 35-6.

‡ *Chikka Dēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, p. 18, *et seq.*, and *Chikka Dēvarāja Vijayam*, Canto iv, Stanza 170, *et seq.* Śrīrangapaṭna 14, 64 and others. *Vide* Genealogical Table No. iii.

Dēvaiya, the third son, was the successor ruling for a short time in the name of his eldest brother who must have been old, and then in his own name, on condition that the said brother's son should succeed him. Wilks and the *Palace History* alike seem to have gone wrong in certain particulars about this ruler, and the mistake is accounted for by all the four brothers bearing the same name, Dēvarāja, with a qualifying epithet. Besides the fact that Chikka Dēvarāja and his father were in prison at Tirukaṇāmbi is not borne out by any other authority. It is, however, mentioned that Chikka Dēvarāja was sent away as a youth with his two wives to Guṇḍlu, remote from Court, to keep him from profligate ways into which he was falling.* His father, on the other hand, lived with his younger brother at Śrīrangapaṭna and then retired to a village where he died soon after. Besides, Chikka Dēvarāja is recorded to have offered his services against the confederacy of rulers besieging Erode, and was well nigh entrusted with the command of the army. Besides this, Chikka Dēvarāja was a mere youth, being only twelve years old, when his uncle, a grown-up man, succeeded to the throne.† Thus, then, Kanṭhīrava Narasa was succeeded by his cousin Kempa Dēvaiya, who became Doḍḍa Dēvarāja Woḍēyār of Mysore. At the accession of this ruler to full sovereignty, he was the legal successor, his next elder brother having died. Chikka Dēvarāja, then a youth, was recognised heir-apparent and each of them, the ruler and the heir, was guardian to his younger brother.

---

* *Chikka Dēvarāja Vijayam*, Canto v.

† *Palace History*, p. 100.

The two remarkable events of this reign were, the invasion of the country by Chokkaliuga Nāyaka of Madura, and the siege of Śrīrangapaṭna by Śivappa Nāyaka of Ikkēri, who had but lately overthrown his master and established himself in his place. In both these events Śrīranga Rāyal, the fugitive ruler of Vijayanagar, was put forth as the leader. Chokkalinga Nāyaka, having made himself independent ruler of Madura, wanted to make the most of the imperial fugitive then with him, and advanced in the latter's name to Erode, on the south-east frontier of Mysore, assisted by Anantoji of Tanjore, Vedoji of Bijapur, Golkoṇḍa, Gingee, and Ayyappa Nāyaka of the Kāḷahasti family. Perplexed by the magnitude of the invading army, Doḍḍa Dēvarāja wished to try diplomacy, when Chikka Dēvarāja offered his services to lead the Mysore forces to victory over the disunited mass of the invading army. Chokkalinga Nāyaka, however, on the advice of his ambassador at Śrīrangapaṭna retired to Trichinopoly, leaving his allies to take care of themselves. It was, perhaps, true, as Chikka Dēvarāja is made to say, that the allied army, though large in number, was wanting in discipline; but one cannot but suspect that the ambassador was bribed into effectually detaching his master from the coalition. Chokkalinga Nāyaka apart, the others were easily defeated by the *Daḷavāis*, the superior generalship of Chikka Dēvarāja having been found unnecessary. Ayyappa Nāyaka was slain, and among those defeated was the Brahman Nāyaka of Ginjee.* The Mysore general took the elephant *Kulaśēkhara* and its mate as spoils of war, and made the permanent conquests

*Śrīrangapaṭna 14, p. 10, Translation (*Epi. Car.*).

of Omalūr, Erode and Dārāpuram. Thus ended the formidable coalition in the name of the last scion of the Vijayanagar family, who now betook himself to Bednore.

Śivappa Nāyaka, immediately after his accession to power, sent an embassy to Mysore professing friendship to the ruler. This seems to have been refused acceptance as beneath the ruler's dignity, coming as it did from a usurper. This gave offence, and Śivappa Nāyaka prepared to lay siege to Śrīrangapaṭna, Śrīranga Rāyal was now with Śivappa Nāyaka, who extended his frontiers in the name of the fugitive. This invasion was successfully repelled, the Bednore Nāyaka having been compelled to cede the fortresses of Hassan and Sakkarēpaṭna. Nothing more was heard of Śrīranga Rāyal, and thus came to an end the once glorious dynasty of Vijayanagar.

Doḍḍa Dēvarāja never appears to have led an army in person. He was generally peacefully inclined. He devoted a great deal of attention to works of charity. He is said to have established a number of *agrahāras* (villages for Brahmans) and built way-side choultries, at short intervals of distance throughout his dominions. He constructed several tanks, one of those at Mysore among them. His devotion to the goddess *Chāmuṇḍi* led to the construction of the steps up the hill, and to the Basavanandi (a gigantic bull in stone) half-way up.*

His principal items of expenditure of the money gained in wars are naively said by the historian† to have been

* *Palace History*, p. 93, *et seq.*
Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, pp. 35-6.

† *Chikka Dēvarāja Vijayam*, end of Canto v.

three ; providing (1) ornaments to his queens ; (2) endowments to his Brahman friends ; and (3) rewards to servants for meritorious services.

After a reign of thirteen years, he died in 1672 in a progress through his dominions at Chikkanāikanahalli. He was succeeded by his nephew, Chikka Dēvarāja Woḍēyār. as had been previously agreed upon. The reigns of Doḍḍa Dēvarāja and his successor are coeval with that of Aurangzeb in Hindustan, and when it is borne in mind that Chikka Dēva's reign coincided in time with the rise of Sivaji and the difficulties of the Moghul emperor in the south, it will not be difficult to understand how this ruler consolidated his State in comparative peace. The Mussalman power of Bijapur was the most aggressive and troublesome neighbour of Mysore. Bijapur expeditions into Mysore have been for one reason or other frequent, and this power very often interfered in the affairs of the Woḍēyārs. But now, this and the other Mussalman powers of South India had to turn their attention, and to devote it all against the advance of Moghul arms in the south, and the rise of a more dangerous enemy from amongst their own servants, the Mahrattas.* Even the line of conquests of Shaji and his son Sivaji went round the Mysore territory and did not go past Bangalore, thus leaving Mysore at the angle between their northern and southern possessions. At this time it was that Chikka Dēvarāja came to the throne of Śrīrangapaṭna, and worked unostentatiously and cleverly at the unification of the petty States which he had inherited.

*Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, p. 56.

During the first twenty years of his reign, he gradually consolidated the conquests of his predecessors and, after reconquering those places which had been taken back, he extended his conquests principally in two directions. To the south-east he extended his conquests as far as Trichinopoly, while to the north-west he pushed his frontiers far into the territories of his neighbours. Thus he added a large part of Tumkur and Kadur districts and a portion of Chitaldroog to his own dominions. The powerful *gauḍ* of Magadi was gradually giving way before the onsets of more powerful neighbours, and by the acquisition of Bangalore in 1687–8, by purchase from Ekōji, the half brother of Sivaji, Chikka Dēvarāja Woḍēyār reduced him to an insignificant position, till later on he was completely overthrown during Doḍḍa Krishṇarāja Woḍēyār's reign. His conquests before 1679 are detailed as follows *: 'In the east, having conquered the Pāṇḍya king Chokka in battle, he captured Tripura (Trichinopoly) and the wealthy Anandhāpuri. In the west he subdued the Keladi kings, who came against him with the Yavanas, and gained Sakalespura and Arakalgūḍu. In the north, having conquered Ranadhoola Khān, he took Ketasamudra together with Kanbikere, Handalageri, Gulur, Tumkur and Honnavalli. Victorious in battle over Mushṭika who came with Moraśas and Kirātas, he seized Jatakanadurga and changed its name to Chikka Dēvarāya Durga.† The Varāha at Śrīmushṇa, which had been broken in the Yavana invasion, he brought to Śrīrangapaṭna out of devotion to Vishṇu. He took Maddagiri, Midagesi, Bijjavara and Chennarāyadurga, having conquered Timmappa

* Śrīrangapaṭna 157, p. 35, Translation (*Epi. Car.*)

† *Vide* map at the commencement of Wilks' *History*, Vol. i.

Gauḍa and Rāmappa Gauda.' By 1686 * Vishṇu, incarnate as Chikkadēva, did subdue in Panchavaṭi, Dadoji, Jaitaji and others in the form of Mahrattas. Sambhu lost his valour, Kuṭub Shah failed in his purpose. Ikkēri Basava was disgraced, Ekoji was deserted by all when the mighty Chikka Dēvarāja, having cut off all the limbs and slit the noses of Jaitaji and Jesvata, set forth for war.' Chikka Dēvarāja, however, is more remembered for the administrative reforms he introduced into the government of his State. His first minister was the Jain Visha Lakshaṇa Pandit of Yelandur, who exercised great influence over the Rāja. He was his companion, or his tutor, when, as a prince, he was sent to Guṇḍlu near Tirukaṇāmbi in order to keep the Rāja from evil ways. When the prince succeeded his uncle, he appointed the Pundit to be his chief minister and, under his guidance, he began to reform every department of the administration. It has been already mentioned that, in Kanṭhīrava's reign, there was a great variety in the currency of the realm, and that this was put an end to by the introduction of the Kanṭhīrava coins as the sole currency. There was also a great deal of variety in the details of all the departments of the administration. This was all done away with, and uniformity was introduced by Chikka Dēvarāja. The first reform was a revision of taxes which cost the life of the Jain Pundit, the responsible author of the revision. This affront to the dignity of the ruler was more than avenged by a wholesale massacre of the fanatical Jungam priests, who were suspected of being the authors, or the instigators of the murder.

---

* Śrīrangapaṭna 14, p. 11, Translation (*Epi. Car.*).

From time immemorial the rent of land remained fixed, and whatever extra revenue was needed was raised by means of taxes. In the reign of Rāja Woḍēyār, the only sources of revenue, as mentioned above, were rents of land, plunder from enemies, and tribute from other Woḍēyārs. Kanṭhīrava Narasa is said to have taken an extraordinary contribution of almost all the movables under some pretext or other. Thus we see that, though extraordinary contributions were demanded, there was nothing like a regular system of taxation. In the absence of any precedent for enhancing the rent of land, Chikka Dēvarāja Woḍēyār deemed it necessary to legalize and systematize the extra demands by instituting a number of taxes. These taxes were none of them the creation of Chikkadēva, but old ones which had fallen out of use during the disturbed times that intervened. In one of the inscriptions, dated A.D. 1290 we find incidentally a list of taxes collected under Perumāḷa Daṇḍanāyaka, the prime minister of Narasimhadēva of the Hoysala dynasty. On a comparison of this list with those given in Wilks' *History of Mysore* and in the *Palace History*, it will be found that there is a close agreement, thus showing that they were only old taxes revived.

When all this was done, Chikka Dēvarāja Woḍēyār turned his attention to the administrative divisions of his territory, and divided the whole State, as it then existed, into eighty-four *ghaḍis* (divisions) each under a *subahdār* (amildar). Some such division appears to have already existed. Chikka Dēvarāja equalized their extent. The central administration was divided into eighteen departments on the model of the Moghul administration. This

must have been the result of the embassy to the imperial Court during the closing years of the century, when the Great Moghul, in his difficulties, condescended to receive 'a Vakil from the Zemindar of Mysore.' This arrangement still survives in the public offices, which are popularly known as the 'Eighteen Cutcheries.' Chikka Dēvarāja Woḍēyār kept down the Woḍēyārs with an iron hand, and reduced them to complete dependence on the central authority. This was done by means of one of his departments, which combined the postal and the spy system, and which informed him of all that took place even at great distances from Court.* He is said to have introduced a kind of militia police system, each *hobli*, or sub-division of a *ghaḍi*, maintaining a certain number of men in its service, who were to be policemen in ordinary times and soldiers in times of war.† In one word, then, Chikkadēva introduced order and system where confusion had reigned. One other matter should be mentioned here. Having introduced uniformity in measures, weights, etc., he next introduced the system of paying his officials half their salary in money and the other half in kind. The convenience of this arrangement in those days was beyond a doubt. After all these reforms, the total revenue derived by Chikka Dēvarāja Woḍēyār from his territories is said to have been seven hundred and twenty thousand pagodas. The method of the collection of this amount was somewhat peculiar. It was arranged to bring in two thousand pagodas every day to the royal treasury at Śrīrangapaṭna, and unless this daily instalment came in Chikka Dēvarāja

* Wilks' *History*, Vol. 1, p. 31.

† *Palace History*, pp. 134-7.

refused to take breakfast. Thus he ensured the collection of the revenue; but how this daily amount was raised and what was the actual amount paid by the ryots, it is not possible now to determine. This revenue, at three rupees a pagoda, would amount to twenty-one lakhs and sixty thousand rupees, the present revenue of the State (in 1898) being one crore and seventy lakhs approximately.* There are not data enough available to institute any real comparison between the revenues of the State now and those of two centuries ago.

Chikka Dēvarāja divided the whole class of Woḍēyārs into two sections of thirteen and eighteen families. The first of these sections included the royal family itself, which was known to have preserved its blood free from any admixture. This class was prohibited from giving away their girls to members of the other class, though permitted to take the girls of the latter for junior wives. The second section was charged with having contracted marriage alliances with people of lower classes, and thus they were treated as being inferior to the other.† This classification was really due to the fact that the second class of Woḍēyārs comprised the recently conquered Woḍēyārs. Their poverty and caste distinctions may also have called for this classification. Nowadays, however, no such distinction is kept up, and all classes of *arasus* are regarded as one.

During the reign of Chikka Dēvarāja, the *Daḷavāis* do not seem to have made themselves prominent. He was

* *Palace History*, pp. 124-5.
Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, p. 63.

† *Palace History*, p. 127.

guided by the counsels of a few friends, who were unconnected with the royal family, although they held high offices. These ministers sometimes advised conjointly but very often singly. The chief of these, after the murder of the Jain Pundit Visha Lakshaṇa of Yelandur, was Tirumala Aiyangar, the companion of the Rāja from his boyhood. He is the author of the Kannaḍa works already referred to but he unfortunately breaks off his narrative when he comes to the reign of Chikka Dēvarāja, thus leaving his works incomplete.

Chikka Dēvarāja Woḍēyār, in his later days, was a staunch follower of the principles of Rāmānuja. The Vijayanagar viceroys of Śrīrangapaṭna were all of them Vaishṇavas, and Rāja Woḍēyār seems to have been of the same creed, either out of policy or of faith, but it cannot, also, be said that all his successors were consistently such. Chāmarāja and Doḍḍa Dēvarāja do not appear to have been very zealous about the sect. Kanṭhīrava Narasa devoted himself heart and soul to Vishṇu. Chikka Dēvarāja, probably through the influence of Tirumala Aiyangar, became a Vaishṇava, perhaps after adopting the principles of his first minister the Jain Pundit* for some time. In his zeal for the Vaishṇavas, he is said to have commanded all the Woḍēyārs to become Vaishṇavas too. This order was withdrawn on the strong representation of a number of Woḍēyārs†. His devotion to Vishṇu led to the construction of a temple at Mysore, dedicated to the god *Svēta Varāha* (white bear) of Śrīmushṇam. The idol seems to

* Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, p. 124.

† *Palace History*, p. 132.

have been roughly handled by the Muhammadans in one of their incursions into the far south, and was in consequence brought by Chikka Dēva to Mysore.*

Thus having consolidated his dominions and introduced a settled form of administration, he bequeathed his kingdom to his dumb son, Kanṭhīrava Narasa in 1704, just three years before the death of the great Moghul Aurangzeb. From the death of Chikka Dēvarāja dates the decline of prosperity of the Woḍēyārs, just as that of his imperial contemporary marks the turning point in the history of the Moghuls.

The succession of a dumb ruler, impossible under a less settled government, was brought about to suit the father's wish by his friend Tirumala Aiyangar under the pretence of a supernatural intervention.† The ruler could not have done anything, and thus in this reign alone, the reins of government slipped perceptibly out of the hands of the sovereign into the hands of *Daḷavāys*. These latter officers gradually usurped the real power in the State. The *Daḷavāys* of this reign are Kānthia and his son Nanjarāja; his son Basavarāja and his son Nanjarāja. The last was succeeded by the Kaḷale Veerajiah, the son of Doḍḍarāja, and the father of the brothers *Daḷavāy* Dēvarāja and Nanjarāja of the later reigns. Under the first *Daḷavāy* and his son and grandson, the Mysore people conquered the two Baḷḷapurs, Miḍigesi, and Sira. It is also during this reign that the Nawab of Arcot makes his appearance in Mysore,

* *Vide* ante p. 300 (quotation).

† *Palace History*, pp. 145–6.

levying the 'contribution war'.* Thus having reigned rather than ruled, for nine years he passed away, leaving the succession to Doḍḍa Krishṇarāja Woḍēyār, who was more remarkable for reckless charity than for any administrative qualities.

This Krishṇarāja Woḍēyār is, in contradistinction to one of his successors of the same name, known as Doḍḍa Krishṇarāja. He is celebrated in some of the inscriptions of his times for large and numerous gifts to Śrī Vaishṇava Brahmans in particular. This reign is remarkable for giving the best of opportunities to the *Daḷavay* brothers for their ascent to power. They eventully became the king-makers of the state. It is, however, worth noting here that the time itself was rich in producing usurpers and king-makers. This is seen in Delhi, Poona and Mysore. The last *Daḷavāy* of Kanṭhīrava Narasa was Veerājiah of Kaḷale. The elder of the two sons of this *Daḷavāy* was Dēvarāja who, in his turn, became *Daḷavāy* and retained the office almost till the usurpation of Ḥaidar Āli. This *Daḷavāy*, whose sister was one of the wives of the Rāja, soon contrived to fill up important offices with his own people, and, by pampering the king with all conceivable luxuries, managed to concentrate all royal power in the State in his own hands. The rise of this person to prominence ultimately brought about the downfall of the dynasty, though for the time being it made the administration sonewhat vigorous. The most important events of this reign, other than the above, are two invasions of the kingdom ending in the siege of Śrīrangapaṭna and the final overthrow of the Gauḍ of

* Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, p. 140.

Magadi. The first of these two invasions was undertaken by a confederacy of newly created Nawabs. The Mysore territory was surrounded by the dominions of Nawab Saādatullāh of the Karnatic Payinghat and Ameen Khān of the Karnatic Bālaghat. Besides these, there were the Nawabs of Kaḍapa, Kurnool, and Sāvandi. There was also a Mahratta neighbour Siddoji Ghorepara of Gooti. Śrīrangapaṭna was laid siege to by all these six together, and Krishṇarāja bought them all off by the payment of seventy-two lakhs of rupees to be equally divided among them, and twenty-eight lakhs in addition given to the negotiator of the peace,* Saādatullāh Khān, though the *Palace History* claims a victory to Mysore in this case as in the next. But the elaborate copper-plate grants which dwell at great length on the other virtues of Krishṇarāja make no mention of any such victory, and a victory is the last thing to be silently passed over by the panegyrist.† Besides this, the victories of the other sovereigns are carefully mentioned in the same grants, one of which makes mention of the victories of *Daḷavāy* Dēvarāja.‡ The author of one of the grants referred to is Tirumala Aiyangar, who must, at least, have lived up to 1729, whereas the dates of these two invasions, as given by the *Palace History*, are 1725 for the confederate invasion, and 1727 for the Mahratta invasion. So in both these the Mysoreans must have had the worst of it.§ The second expedition was undertaken by Bāji Rao at the head of the

---

* Wilks' *History*, Vol. i, pp. 141–2.

† Śrīrangapaṭna 64 and 100.

‡ Tirumakuḍlu Narasipura 63, pp. 79–80 (Translation).

§ Śrīrangapaṭna 64, p. 24 (Translation *Epi. Car.*).

Mahrattas, and the Peshwa was likewise bought off by Krishṇarāja. To redeem these failures *Daḷavāy* Dēvarāja succeeded in taking possession of the impregnable rock of Savandroog, the stronghold of the Gauḍ of Magadi. The Gauḍ himself was taken prisoner and allowed to die in the state prison at Śrīrangapaṭna.* In spite of this, however, the weakness of the Mysore State to defend itself against foreign invaders was proved beyond a doubt by the two invasions mentioned above, and this discovery led to a great deal of foreign complications, which facilitated the upward coure, first of the *Daḷavāy* brothers and secondly of Ḥaidar Āli. Having reigned for eighteen years Doḍḍa Krishṇarāja died without an heir in 1731. *Daḷavāy* Dēvarāja, with the consent of the widow of Krishṇarāja, who, however, was not his sister, placed a certain Chāmarāja, connected but remotely with the ruling family, on the throne. The legitimate line of rulers thus came to an end here, and Chāmarāja had no more claim to the throne than what he derived from the nomination of the widow and the *Daḷavāy*. This personage was not long in showing himself to be very far from being the docile instrument of the *Daḷavāy* that he had agreed to become, when he was nominated ruler. He was, therefore, made the victim of an intrigue and sent to Kabbaladroog with his family. This time the *Daḷavāy* was careful to place an infant three years old on the throne to avoid the recurrence of the difficulties. This nomination was in perfect keeping with the projects of king-makers generally, the real rulers of Mysore now being *Daḷavāy* Dēvarāja and *Sarvādhikāri* Nanjarāja, the *Daḷavāy's* uncle. On the retirement of this latter officer,

* Wilks' *History*, Vol. i., pp. 140–3.

the appointment was conferred upon Karachūri Nanjarājaiya (the brother of the *Daḷavāy*), who, later on, became the father-in-law of the infant ruler Immaḍi Krishṇarāja Woḍēyār. The administration was carried on by these two brothers with the nominal *Pradhāni* Venkaṭapati of Canniambādi, with considerable vigour till, owing to the advanced age of Dēvarāja, the brothers exchanged offices. This change led to a misunderstanding between the brothers, which eventually proved fatal to their power, and thus paved the way for the rise of Ḥaidar Āli, who became the *de facto* ruler in A.D. 1761. Thus was brought to an end the rule of the Woḍēyārs in Mysore, till it was revived under the ægis of the British power after the fall of Śrīrangapaṭna in A.D. 1799. The power of the Woḍēyārs thus passed through all the stages of decay that the Moghul rule underwent, but it had the good fortune to be revived which was denied to the other.

We have now traced the gradual growth of the small principality of Rāja Woḍēyār until it became a compact and powerful State under Chikka Dēvarāja. We have also made a rapid survey of the decline of fortune of the ruling family, until the State passed out of its hands into those of a foreigner.

[*Thesis submitted for the M.A. Degree of the Madras University in 1898, and published in the Madras Review of May 1900.*]

APPENDIX

I.—WILKS' GENEALOGICAL TABLE.

- Vijaya. (Hadana and Kārugahalli.)
  - Chāmarāja. (Ārberaḷ = Six-fingered.)
    - Beṭad Chāmarāja. ,, ,, (1507)
      - Appan Timmarāja Hemanhalli.
        - Betad Woḍēyār (1576 to 1578).
          - Kanṭhīrava Narasa (1638 to 1659).
        - Rāja Woḍēyār (1578 to 1617).
          - Narasa.
            - Chāmarāja (1617 to 1637).
          - Immaḍi Rāja (Posthumous) (1637–8).
      - Krishṇa (Kembala).
      - Boḷe Chāmarāja (Mysore).
        - Muppin Dēvarāja.
          - Doḍḍa Dēvaiya.
            - Chikka Dēvarāja (1672 to 1674).
              - Kanṭhīrava Narasarāja (1704 to 1714).
                - Doḍḍa Krishṇarāja (1714 to 1731).
                  - Two usurpers Chāmarāja (1731 to 1734).
                    - Chikka Krishṇarāja (1734 to 1766).
          - 2nd
          - 3rd
          - Kempa Dēvaiya (1659 to 1672).
            - Doḍḍa Dēvaiya.
        - Here Chāmarāja.

II.—DAḶAVĀY GRANT No. 63, TIRUMAKUḌLU NARASIPURA.

(*Epi-Carnataka.*)

- Chāmarāja.
  - Timmarāja.
  - Krishṇarāja.
  - Beṭad Chāmarāja.
    - Rāja Woḍēyār.
      - Narasarāja.
        - Chāmarāja.
          - Immaḍirāja.
            - Kanṭhīrava Narasa.
              - Dēvarājēndra.
                - Chikka Dēvarāja.
                  - Kanṭhīrava Narasa.
                    - Krishṇarāja Nripathi.
                      - Krishṇarāja.

III.—SRIRANGAPATAM, NOS. 64 AND 100 OF EPIGRAPHIA CARNATAKA.

(*Copper-plate 64 and inscription 100 of Srirangapatam.*)

- Yadu.
  - Beṭad Chāmarāja (*Antembaragaṇḍa*).
    - Timmarāja.
    - Krishṇa Bhūpati.
    - Chāma Nripati. (Victor over Revati Venkaṭa).
      - Rājādhirāja.
      - Beṭad Chāmarāja.
      - Dēvarājēndra.
        - Amritāmba = Doḍḍa Dēvarāja.
          - Dēvamāmba = Chikka Dēvēndra.
            - Kanṭhīrava Narasa = Cheluvājamāmba.
              - Krishṇarāja = Dēvājammah and eight others (Hence the names of eight tanks at Mēlukōṭe).
          - Kanṭhīrava Mahīpathi.
        - Chikka Dēvarājēndra.
        - Dēvarāja.
        - Mariḍēva.
      - Chāmarāja.

IV.—PALACE HISTORY.

- Yadu Rāja (1399 to 1423).
  - Here Beṭad Chāmarāja Woḍēyar (1423 to 1458).
    - Timmarāja Woḍēyar (1458 to 1478).
      - Here Chāmarāja Woḍēyar (1478 to 1513).
        - Beṭad Chāmarāja (1513 to 1552).
          - Timmarāja (1552 to 1571).
          - Krishṇarāja.
          - Bole Chāmarāja (1571 to 1576).
            - Beṭad Chāmarāja (1576 to 1578).
              - Rāja Woḍēyar.
              - Kanṭhīrava Narasa (1638 to 1659).
            - Rāja Woḍēyar. (1578 to 1617).
              - Narasa Rāja.
                - Chāmarāja (1617 to 1637).
              - Beṭad Woḍēyar.
              - Nanjarāja.
              - Chāma-rāja.
              - Immaḍi Rāja (1617 to 1638).
            - Muppin Dēvarāja.
              - 1st.
              - 2nd.
              - Doḍḍa Dēvarāja (1659 to 1672).
                - Chikka Dēvarāja (1672 to 1704).
                  - Kanṭhīrava Narasa (1704 to 1713).
                    - Doḍḍa Krishṇarāja (1713 to 1731).
                      - Chāmarāja (1713 to 1734).
                      - Chikka Krishṇarāja (1734 to 1761).

                      Both of these adopted by the widow of Doḍḍa Krishṇarāja.
                - Kanṭhīrava Narasa.
            - Chāmarāja.
  - Chāmarāja Woḍēyar.

V.—THE GENEALOGICAL TREE ADOPTED IN THIS CHAPTER.

- Yadu (1399 to 1423).
  - Here Beṭad Chāmarāja (1423 to 1458).
    - Timmarāja Woḍēyār (1458 to 1478).
      - Here Chāmarājarasa (1478 to 1513).
        - Beṭad Chāmarāja (1513 to 1552).
          - Timmarāja (1552 to 1571).
            - Beṭad Woḍēyar (1576 to 1578).
          - Krishṇarāja
          - Bole Chāmarāja (1571 to 1576).
            - Rājādhirāja (1578 to 1617).
              - Narasarāja.
                - Chāmarāja Woḍēyar (1617 to 1678).
              - Beṭad Woḍēyar
              - Nanjarāja.
              - Chāmarāja.
              - Immaḍi Rāja (1637-8).
            - Beṭad Chāmarāja.
              - Rāja Woḍēyar (died young).
              - Kanṭhīrava Narasa (1638 to 1659).
            - Muppin Dēvarāja.
              - Doḍḍa Dēvarāja.
                - Chikka Dēvarāja (1672 to 1704).
                  - Kanṭhīrava Narasa (1704 to 1713).
                    - Doḍḍa Krishṇarāja (1713 to 1731).
                      - Chāmarāja (1731 to 1734).
                      - Chikka Krishṇarāja (1734 to 1761).
                - Kanṭhīrava Narasa.
              - Chikka Dēvarājēndra.
              - Kempa Dēvaiya (1659 to 1672).
              - Maridēva.
  - Chāmarāja.

Mysore and the Decline of the Vijayanagar Empire.

The Position of the Mysore Territory under Vijayanagar.—The present-day State of Mysore is a product of the nineteenth century and came into existence as a political entity with the fall of Seringapatam and the treaty that immediately followed, concluding the war; but the whole of this block of territory was included in the empire of the Hoysalas in their best days and continued to be under them to the last days of the existence of that dynasty. Hoysala Sōmēśvara's boundary reached as far south as Trichinopoly and extended northwards to Pandharpūr. Under his successors the northern frontier remained the same and the southern frontier stretched southwards at one time to include the whole of the state of Pudukottah and even parts of the Ramnad district. This largest southern extension was attained while the war against the Muhammadan Sultans of Madura was still in progress.* When, as a result of the national war of the Hindus against Muhammadan occupation of the south, Vijayanagar came into existence, rising phoenix-like from the ashes of the empire of Hoysalas, the block of territory under consideration was distributed among four governments which took in the whole of the block and parts of many other frontier territories besides. These were the four viceroyalties with

*See the author's *South India and her Muhammadan Invaders*, Ch. vi.

their headquarters at Āraga, Hosapaṭṭaṇa-Haḷebīḍ, Muḷbāgal and Penugoṇḍa. Of these four, the first took into it the Malērājya, the Malnāḍ districts of Mysore, and Tuḷu, the coast districts extending southwards from Goa to Mangalore; Hosapaṭṭaṇa-Haḷebīḍ constituted the headquarters viceroyalty with the capital located in the royal capital of the Hoysalas, namely Haḷebīḍ, but with an important outpost in the newly created, though the fast expanding, Hosapaṭṭaṇa, the Vijayanagar of later times. This took in practically the whole of the central block of what is now the state of Mysore. Muḷbāgal was the next viceroyalty which seems to have included in it a considerable part of the Kolar district and the neighbouring territories along the Pālār river southwards at least as far as Tiruvallam and Virinchipuram, the headquarters of other older chieftaincies, Penugoṇḍa in the east took in the outer margin of the Tumkur, and a small portion of the Kolar districts, and extended its sphere over perhaps the larger half of the so-called Ceded Districts of the present-day. This seems to have been the geographical distribution of the territory now comprised within the state of Mysore. We do not hear in this period of the later important viceroyalty of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam, or of the equally important but somewhat short-lived viceroyalty of Channapaṭṭaṇa. Even the state of Ikkēri as such seems not to figure in the earlier records of this period.

Creation of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam Government.—This division of territory seems to have continued almost unaltered under the first dynasty of Vijayanagar from A.D. 1336 to A.D. 1467. The comparatively weak rule of

Mallikārjuna, successor of the great Dēvarāya II, and the constant attacks upon the empire by the Bahmani kingdom on the one side and by the rising state of Orissa on the other, sometimes acting in concert and often without, made the position of the empire difficult to maintain. An officer of the empire springing of a family which had its patrimony in the Chittoor district of the present-day, round the towns of Chandragiri and Nārāyaṇavanam, rose into prominence during these troubled times. He gradually extended his authority to take into his sphere the whole of the Vijayanagar viceroyalty of Udayagiri, and placed himself between the enterprising power of Orissa and the more exposed and fertile coast regions of the empire of Vijayanagar in the south. As the empire grew weaker and weaker he seems gradually to have extended his authority so as to bring under his influence the whole of the territories dominated by Kānchi and Muḷbāgal so that in the height of his power his territory extended from Nāgamangala in Mysore, not far from the Kāvēri, to the east coast. His general Narasa is found active in the south and seems to have won for his master victories over various chieftains in the immediate vicinity of Madura, so that we may take it that the territory of this rising officer of the empire, Śāḷuva Narasinga, extended almost from Rājahmundri in the north to Madura in the south.* While Narasinga had gradually extended his territory and influence in this fashion, the empire suffered the calamity of a usurpation by Virūpākṣa, the half-brother of Mallikārjuna ascending the throne by

* See the author's A little known Chapter of Vijayanagar History, pp. 31-47.

putting aside his two nephews and perhaps even by putting Mallikārjuna to death. Virūpākṣa had not the qualities of a ruler who would assure quiet possession even of usurped territory. His administration seems to have been feeble in the extreme, and conducted with such a degree of thoughtlessness that even the part of the west coast which contributed so much to the prosperity of the empire began to fall away from it.* Narasinga let matters reach this pass apparently and usurped the empire under circumstances which would enable him to assume the role of saviour of the empire. In the course of his strenuous career which raised him from the position of a petty chieftain to the empire, he had the loyal support of a number of able generals and officers who whole-heartedly co-operated with him. Among them, the first rank undoubtedly belongs to Narasa Nāyaka who rendered yeoman service to the usurper, and retained throughout the confidence and esteem of his master. It was he who was responsible for the extension of Narasinga's authority as far as Madura and he seems to have been equally responsible for a westward extension of the same authority which made Narasa's frontiers reach the Kāvēri in the state of Mysore. In the course of one of his wars he is said to have bridged the rapidly flowing Kāvēri and, after crossing it, to have taken possession of Seringapatam and erected a pillar of victory by the great fame of this achievement.† It is this occasion that first brings Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇa into notice. Probably Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇa remained the seat of a government of an important character and in all probability under a family of

* *Ibid.*, pp. 12-23.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 68-69.

chieftains who, for some reason or other, were regarded as of more than ordinarily high rank. This state of things appears to have continued during the reigns of Narasinga and his son, and of Narasa himself afterwards. When Narasimha II or Vīra-Narasimha, the son of Narasa, ascended the throne in succession to the father, there seems to have been a general revolt of the empire. What exactly might have been the provoking cause of this is nowhere stated clearly as far as we know at present. It seems to have been due, however, to an act of usurpation by this Narasimha, as else there is but little reason to explain a general revolt.* Narasimha struggled hard and brought back practically the whole of the empire under allegiance to him except the region round Kānchi and the block of territory in southern Mysore under the chieftain of Ummattūr, by name Gangarāja, a scion apparently of the old dynasty of the Gangas. This chieftain is described as *Penugoṇḍa Chakrēśvara* (ruler of the territory of Penugoṇḍa), and as possessed of the *Chikkarāja-paṭṭa* (the title of prince). It was probably Narasa who was responsible for raising Gangarāja of Ummattūr to the actual viceroyalty of Penugoṇḍa and to the extraordinary title of 'prince' to a member not belonging to the royal family. This title was probably a reward for loyal service rendered by this enterprising chieftain in the course of his conquests referred to above. This powerful chieftain, Gangarāja, remained yet unsubdued when Narasimha died after a short reign.

Krishṇa succeeded to the throne in 1509 and had to reduce this recalcitrant chieftain as the first act of his

* *Ibid.*, pp. 71-75.

administration. Having opent the first few months after his coronation in putting the administration in order for his long absence, Krishṇa started on this expedition towards Penugoṇḍa. He was able to take possession of Penugoṇḍa easily and then marched upon Kānchi; and, subduing the petty chieftains on the way, he moved upon the territory of Gangarāja and laid siege to the citadel Śivasamudram. The siege apparently lasted some time and Krishṇa had to drain off the Kāvēri and take the fortress by storm. The capture of Śivasamudram put an end to Gangarāja's resistance and leaving behind Śāḷuva Gōvinda, the Brahman general, to introduce an orderly administration into the conquered territory. Krishṇa proceeded to Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam and thence to Ikkēri and further onwards to the territory of Bijapur. It is in this campaign of Krishṇa that both Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam and Ikkēri come somewhat prominently into notice.*

Condition under the Empire.—Neither of these two places, however, figures prominently in the course of the history of the empire. It seems likely that the family of the chieftain of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam entered into marriage relations with the imperial family as Tirumalāmba, the chief queen of Krishṇa, seems to have been of that family. The young chief of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam, probably the heir-apparent, played a prominent part in the battle of Raichur. The Ikkēri Nāyaka sometimes figures in the history of the later empire. Otherwise, these remained headquarters of governments and do not seem to have been of any greater importance than this.

* For authorities see the author's paper Krishṇadēvarāya of Vijayanagar, pp. 5-8.

The Battle of Talikota.—The battle of Talikota had the important consequence of shifting the centre of the empire from Vijayanagar. The change of capital had its own consequences of the utmost importance. The most important of these latter was the opening up of the way to the southern provinces for the aggressive activities of the two southern States of the Bahmani kingdom, Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa. According to Caesar Frederick, the battle of Talikota went against Vijayanagar, chiefly through the treachery of two Muhammadan officers who each commanded a force of 70,000 to 80,000 in the army of Vijayanagar. According to the same authority, the town was given up to loot for six months but was not otherwise destroyed to the extent to make it the ruins that they have since become. Tirumala, younger brother of Rāmarāja, returned to the place, and Caesar Frederick has a tale to tell of how he cheated the horse traders of the value of the horses sold to him, particularly those taken from the Vijayanagar armies in the battle. Caesar Frederick himself lived about seven months in Vijayanagar, though unwillingly, on business. It was two years after the battle that Tirumala changed the capital to Penugoṇḍa. He is said to have carried 350 elephant-loads of treasure from Vijayanagar which would indicate that even the sack of Vijayanagar by the Muhammadans was not as complete as one would take it from the city having been subjected to a six-months' looting. There were also disturbances in the kingdom owing to the recent death of Sadāśiva, who according to the same authority was murdered by Tirumala's son. The disturbance caused by this perfidious act made the working of the diamond mines impossible and perhaps also contributed indirectly to the

choice of Penugoṇḍa for the capital. Thus, it appears clear that the transfer of capital from Vijayanagar to Penugoṇḍa was a move which did not result immediately from the battle of Talikota but had other important causes to necessitate the change. The capital once changed from the first line of defence laid open the Krishna frontier and naturally proved an inducement to the southward march of the forces of Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa either in concert or each one for itself. In the reign of Tirumala, therefore, he had to struggle against internal troubles and dissensions caused by the murder of the legitimate ruler Sadāśiva. He had also to be perpetually active against the aggressions of his northern neighbours of Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa. It was as a result of this condition of affairs that, at his death, a division of the empire was brought about which seems to have implied nothing more than a division of the spheres of activity among his three sons. The eldest surviving one Śrīranga succeeded to the empire with his capital at Penugoṇḍa. His special sphere must have been the keeping of internal disorders under control and the external aggressions from the Muhammadans in check. He succeeded on the whole in maintaining his position although he had to stand several seiges at Penugoṇḍa by the Golkoṇḍa forces, and on one occasion in A.D. 1579 fell a prisoner into the hands of Ibrahim Kuṭub Shah of Golkoṇḍa through the treachery of Haṇḍē Malakappa Nāyuḍu, the chief of Anantapur. He obtained release probably as the result of a treaty and continued to rule for another six or seven years till about A.D. 1585–86. His next younger brother Rāma was created ruler over the territory above the ghats and was located in Seringapatam as his viceregal capital. It is from this

time onwards that Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam assumes an important role, and it is from this viceroyalty as we shall see presently that the present State of Mysore arose. The third brother Venkaṭa was given the government of the whole of the Tamil country with his headquarters at Chandragiri. These viceroyalties involved the exercise of the imperial authority over various provinces, each of which had its own separate governor so that this division may be regarded more or less as a division of the imperial authority rather than that of any distribution of territory. The division shows clearly that the empire of Vijayanagar fell back upon its second line of defence and is a clear indication that the move was of the character of a retreat,—may be, a retreat in good order,—for the time being. Śrīranga died, and his next brother Rāma apparently died before him, and the imperial authority again united in Venkaṭa, the last brother, in or about the year A.D. 1585–86.

The change of rulers was taken advantage of apparently by the rulers of Golkoṇḍa who laid siege again to Penugoṇḍa. This time Penugoṇḍa was saved by the active exertions of Rāṇa Pedda Jagadēvarāyal as he is called. He was given, as a reward for this service to the empire, a new government created obviously on the occasion, with its headquarters at Channapaṭṭaṇa.

It was about 1580 or soon after that the Nāyak of Madura Muttuvīrappa, the Governor of the remotest viceroyalty of the empire with headquarters in Madura, made the first move towards setting himself up, independently of the empire. Venkaṭapati whose sphere of duty it was to control this distant governorship seems to have sent

out an expedition to co-operate with the armies of the Nāyak of Tanjore, Achyuta. The two forces co-operated and won a victory against the Pāṇḍya forces at Vallam. Later in the century or early in the beginning of the next, there was another rebellion set up by the Nāyak of Madura and this time Venkaṭapati sent out an expedition under the command of his nephew Tirumala, the elder of the two sons of Rāma, viceroy of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam, who apparently predeceased his elder brother Śrīranga who died in 1585–86. His two sons Rāma and Śrīranga, being young, lived with their uncle at Penugoṇḍa, while the administration of the viceroyalty of their father was carried on by a deputy whose name is given in Mysore inscriptions and records as Rēmati or Rēvati Venkaṭa. Tirumala instead of carrying out loyally the orders of his uncle seems to have tried to make common cause with the enemy. When in consequence of this attempted defection, he was superseded in command, he retired to his father's viceroyalty and ruled apparently as viceroy of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam in secret defiance of his uncle, if not in open hostility. Venkaṭa's attention was all taken up with troubles nearer home to pay any serious attention to this sulking nephew, and he had to let him go on so long as he did not make any open movement of hostility. About the year A.D. 1610 Golkoṇḍa appeared to have made a persistent effort to conquer the territories round Penugoṇḍa and take possession of the capital itself. The Nāyak of Ginjee seems to have also made an effort to turn traitor. Venkaṭa had to throw the latter into prison and keep him there in Penugoṇḍa. In the course of the next year or the year following, Venkaṭa felt so hemmed in at Penugoṇḍa that he asked for assistance from the Nāyak

of Tanjore. Achyuta, the ruling Nāyak for the time being, a comparatively old man, too pious and devoted to God to take a very active part in these warlike transactions himself, sent his young son, the heir-apparent, a lad of sixteen or seventeen at the head of the whole forces of Tanjore. The prince's efforts were so far sucessful that the Golkoṇḍa forces were beaten back and the siege of Penugoṇḍa was raised to the great satisfaction of the emperor. This difficulty of Venkaṭa was apparently taken advantage of by the smaller chieftains of the viceroyalty at Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam, among them the most enterprising chief Rāja Woḍēyār of Mysore. Among the petty chieftains who were subordinate to the viceroy at Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam there were several who were discontented for one reason or other, and the leader of these malcontents was Rāja Woḍēyār. There were others not very far placed who played the role of loyalists, and thus these chiefs were divided in two camps and were constantly at feud with each other. When the empire was in no condition to send efficient assistance to Tirumala, Rāja Woḍēyār made up his mind to attack the viceregal head-quarters itself and take possession of it after a siege. The fall of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam marked the foundation of the State of Mysore as such, but the victor had to play his game so carefully that he could not set himself up as the conqueror in possession of the conquered territory. He was able successfully to play the role of a champion of the empire, and, when the siege of Penugoṇḍa was raised, he was able to appeal to the emperor Venkaṭa and obtained a charter from him confirming the possession of the Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam viceroyalty which had been actually in his possession since its fall two years before. What actually was the relation

between the viceroy at Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam and the emperor at Penugoṇḍa is not clearly detailed anywhere so far, but it is very likely that the discontented nephew showed himself more actively hostile and intrigued with the enemies of the empire, either the Sultan of Bijapur or the Sultan of Golkoṇḍa. Else, it would be difficult to reconcile the attitude of the emperor who could have gained nothing by getting rid of a sulking nephew of a viceroy only to put in his stead a rising ambitious cheiftain, the limit of whose ambition he could not then foresee. He must have felt that the viceroyalty was from the imperial point of view so very much better in the hands of even an ambitious chieftain whose patriotism was likely to keep the aggressive Muhammadans at arm's length. It was in these circumstances that the State of Mysore was born and received the blessings of the emperor for its prosperous growth.

The Death of Venkaṭa, and the War of Succession.— The emperor Venkaṭa died in A.D. 1614 and this brought about a war of succession which arose out of Venkaṭa's nomination of his nephew as his successor. Venkaṭa had married four or five queens and none of them had a son. One of them, however, a princess of the family of the Gobbūri chiefs, seems to have brought up a boy-child and claimed him as her own son. The boy was allowed to grow up without Venkaṭa making any effort to prevent the growth of this imposition as he seems never to have believed that the boy was her own son. About the time of his death he nominated his nephew Śrīranga, who seems to have already for some time enjoyed the title *Chikkarāya* or *Yuvarāja* (heir-apparent). This Śrīranga was the second

son of Venkaṭa's elder brother Rāma, the viceroy of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam. He seems to have remained at court ever since the death of his father and it is just possible he was nominated *Chikkarāya* while yet the putative boy had not come into existence. However, it happened that Venkaṭa allowed the pretence in regard to the latter to be kept up without putting an end to it in time. His nomination of Śrīranga therefore inevitably led on to the war of succession as soon as some powerful person or party should espouse the cause of the putative son. The Gobbūri chief Jaggarāya (not to be confounded with Jagadēvarāyal) was a brother of the Gobbūri queen of Venkaṭa. He seems to have taken up the cause of the putative prince, but was unable apparently to assert his claims with success while Venkaṭa was alive, or even soon after. Śrīranga therefore quietly succeeded to the throne and perhaps ruled for a year, it could hardly be longer. Jagga had by this time gained the support of some adherents and when he was ready he managed to confine the emporor and his family composed of his wife, three boys and two girls very closely in his palace and arranged to get all of them assassinated. A loyal officer, Yāchama by name, somehow got wind of this plot and began to counteract this move, at least to the extent of securing one of the sons alive, so as to thwart Jagga enjoying the fruits of his treacherous deed, if he could not prevent the deed itself. He was not apparently in possession of sufficient strength to prevent the atrocity, but succeeded in smuggling the second of the boys out of prison through the assistance of the washerman in the service of the royal family. Yāchama looked out for assistance and could find only the Nāyak of Tanjore sufficiently well-disposed to the

emperor to champion the cause of the young boy as against the traitor Jagga and his allies, prominent among whom were the Nāyaks of Madura and Ginjee. Yāchama therefore carried the prince successfully into safety to Tanjore; prince Raghunātha of Tanjore, moving forward to receive him at Kumbbakonam, took him to his father's capital. All the chiefs of the empire with the exception of Mysore and Ikkēri took up the cause of the traitor Jagga, whose allies included a contingent of the Portuguese as well. Tanjore alone espoused the cause of the emporor and a hard-fought battle at a place called Toppūr, a little way above the Grand Anicut of modern times, was fought. The imperial cause won and the fugitive prince Rāma was anointed emperor at Kumbhakonam by Raghunātha Nāyaka of Tanjore.

In this war of succession Mysore remained discreetly aloof. Two alternative explanations of this aloofness seem possible. One is a feeling of disaffection towards the empire, for which *prima facie* there is no reason. The second explanation may perhaps be that Mysore had to keep on the watch against the movements of Bijapur in the north to take an active part on one side or the other in the war of succession. This was probably the more likely explanation as Rāja Wdeyār had really every reason to be grateful to the emperor and had apparently nothing to gain by acting against the emperor. Whatever was the reason Mysore kept out of the war. Rāja Wodeyār, the ruler of Mysore, quietly went on consolidating his newly acquired territory, and when he died later on, in the reign of emperor Rāma, he bequeathed to his successor Chāmarāja

the nice point for decision as to what exactly his attitude should be towards the emperor. The succession war left the empire greatly weakened; and the emperor with the assistance of Tanjore had to carry on a war against each one of the principal chieftains of the empire to bring him into allegiance with but little success as the disintegrating tendencies were too strong for his immediate success to have lasting influence. Chāmarāja Woḍēyār carried on the consolidation work of his grandfather a stage further by taking advantage of the distress in which the empire was during the whole period of his reign. He gradually extended his conquests across the Kāvēri, and, after a series of wars, acquired practically the whole of the viceroyalty of Channapaṭṭaṇa. This he was enabled to do as Rāma's successor Venkaṭa, another collateral cousin made the empire, if anything, weaker. The aggressive activity of the Muhammadans grew with years and the union of the Channapaṭṭaṇa viceroyalty with the territory of Mysore had the advantage at any rate of placing a strong power on the flank of march of aggressive Biiapur. With the accession Kanṭhīrava Narasa, Mysore activities grew more vigorous and he carried the frontiers of Mysore past the foothills on the south coming directly into contact with the territory of the Nāyaka of Madura, thus initiating the period of constant war between Mysore and Madura. A few years after the accession of this Mysore ruler the feeble emperor Venkaṭa died, and Śrīranga, the third of the name in imperial succession ascended the throne. On his accession the empire adopted a more vigorous policy which carried him successfully forward during the first five or six years.

Śrīranga, and his effort to revive the dying Empire.— It was this Śrīranga, according to Jesuit testimony, who could look a little farther ahead and plan out a policy for bringing about a union of all the great feudatories in an effort to bring about a combination for the purpose of reviving the somewhat moribund empire. The Golkoṇḍa and Bijapur activities which had become fitful owing to the Moghul activities in the Dakhan had now begun to be somewhat more vigorous and the periodical invasions against Penugoṇḍa had made the position of the imperial headquarters at Penugoṇḍa well-nigh impossible. Śrīranga's predecessor Venkaṭa, it seems, was responsible for the transfer of capital from Penugoṇḍa to Chandragiri. This meant that Chandragiri became the habitual residence of the emperor. It was probably in this Venkaṭa's reign that Chāmarāja of Mysore was allowed to absorb the Channapaṭṭaṇa viceroyalty without a protest from the emperor. When Śrīranga therefore ascended the throne he had to curb the ambition of Mysore and keep it within bounds. He could perhaps be certain only of the active loyalty of Tanjore. Ginjee was fast falling into the hands of the Muhammadans and Shahji's activities on behalf of Bijapur were already bearing substantial fruit. He had therefore to work vigorously for securing the support of the Nāyak of Madura, at the time of the great Tirumala Nāyaka. The success or failure of the imperial ambition for Śrīranga depended upon the attitude of Tirumala towards Mysore on the one side and towards the empire on the other. At this critical juncture for the emperor, Mysore proved to the country a broken reed to lean upon and Madura deliberately adopted a policy of hostility to the empire. Śrīranga, the emperor apparently

began his reign under hopeful auspices notwithstanding the efforts of Golkoṇḍa to dispossess the empire of as much of its territories in the Carnatic below the Ghats as she could lay hands on. From the commencement of the seventeenth century the struggle had been in the region between the Krishna and the Pālār. The Golkoṇḍa aggressions began with the struggle for the possession of the Koṇḍavīḍu district soon after the death of the great Krishṇadēva and gradually extended in two directions, one along the coast as far as Udayagiri and Nellore, and another through the interior, which had advanced successfully as far as Gaṇḍikōṭṭa from which Penugoṇḍa itself could be attacked. The accession of the last Mir Jumla to power in Golkoṇḍa was marked by more vigour in the operations in this region. Mir Jumla was so far successful in his efforts that he began to regard this part of the Carnatic almost as his own fief, and made every effort to extend it not only in the south, but even in the north, so much so that the province actually extended from Rajahmundri southwards to Kāḷahasti. This extension of the territory of Golkoṇḍa made the position of the emperor in Chandragiri itself dangerous and the capital had again to be shifted to Vellore. Early in the reign of Śrīranga, Vellore had to stand a siege in which he had the assistance of Śivappa Nāyaka of Ikkēri, in all probability under the rule of his predecessor. For the time the Golkoṇḍa forces were beaten back from the walls of Vellore Śrīranga felt he could go farther afield. It was apparently then that he clearly adumbrated his policy of bringing all the greater viceroys under allegiance to him in a common effort at dislodging Golkoṇḍa and Bijapur from their newly-won possessions.

During the period that Golkoṇḍa was advancing along the coast, Bijapur had constantly striven to acquire possession of the southern Mahratta country and extended her authority along the coast through the *Malai* and Tuḷu *Rājyas* of Vijayanagar. They successfully extended their overlordship as far south as Mangalore in this region. They then advanced through the plain districts of Mysore forming the province of Sira which was gradually extended southwards to take in practically the whole of the districts of Tumkūr and Kolar, and thus opened the way for the further advance into the plains of Arcot or further south according to circumstances. The accession of Shahji to the councils of Bijapur at this time supplied the organizing capacity that before was wanting and the efforts of Golkoṇḍa thereafter became more sustained and assumed a definite shape. About the time that Golkoṇḍa laid siege to Vellore, Bijapur seems to have made a dash upon Ginjee and this combined action seems to have been brought about through the countenance, if not the active support, of the Nāyak of Madura. That probably is what the Jesuit letters complain of as the unpatriotic and ungrateful attitude of Tirumala Nāyaka of Madura. This was further complicated by Moghul operations in the Dakhan which assumed greater vigour in the later years of the reign of Shah Jahan when Aurangzeb became viceroy of the Dakhan. It is during this period of respite when the attention of Golkoṇḍa and Bijapur alike were turned towards the Dakhan that Śrīranga could formulate his schemes with good chances of success. Such a scheme was frustrated by what took place in Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa on the one side, and Madura on the other. Through the efforts of the enterprising minister Mir Jumla

a marriage alliance was brought about between Golkoṇḍa and Bijapur so as to enable the two to act together in the pursuit of a common policy and consequently, Tirumala Nāyaka of Madura, instead of supporting the emperor wholeheartedly in his effort at reviving the empire, found it prudent, in the circumstances, to thwart the ambitions of the emperor and play into the hands of Bijapur, out of hostility to the advance of Mysore. The emperor therefore found too little support among his great viceroys for the plans which he had formed of reuniting the empire, and, finding that nobody was hearty in his support, he had to spend a few years as a fugitive in the forests on the borders of the territory of the Nāyak of Tanjore, wherefrom he appealed to Mysore for assistance. According to Jesuit authority the Mysore Rāja gave him asylum and treated him well for a few years, not to further the objects of the emperor, but to satisfy his own ambitions. The emperor had therefore to flee again for safety, which safety he found ultimately in the court of the usurper Śivappa Nāyaka of Ikkēri.

The relation between Madura and Mysore, the guiding feature of this period of history.—During the whole period of activity of emperor Śrīranga, the ruler of Madura was Tirumala Nāyaka and his successor Chokkanātha. Mysore was under Kanṭhīrava Narasa and Doḍḍa Dēvarāja. The Nāyakships of Ginjee and Tanjore were gradually losing their importance; the first of these was occupied by the Bijapur troops and was handed over to the administration of Shahji; the second was under Vijayarāghava Nāyaka, with whom ended the Nāyakship, through a war that came

on between Tanjore and Madura early in the reign of Chokkanātha. This war put an end to the Nāyakship of Tanjore, which ultimately passed into the hands of the Mahrattas. During the whole of this period Madura was the leading southern power as yet nominally feudatory to the empire, but hankering after complete independence. This idea of independence seems to have taken hold of the Nāyaks of Madura beginning with Muttuvīrappa onwards. We have the earliest indication of this tendency soon after the accession of emperor Venkaṭa I, in whose reign Madura found occasion more than once to exhibit this tendency. One such occasion led to the practical independence of the Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇa viceroyalty and ultimately to the foundation of the state of Mysore under the present dynasty. Throughout this period Tanjore stood fast in her loyalty to the empire and when the war of succession followed soon after the death of Venkaṭa, Tanjore was practically the sole power which stood loyal. Among the various chieftains who ranged themselves against the empire, the Nāyak of Madura was the leader. It had come therefore to be more or less the accepted policy of Madura to be hostile to the emperor long before the accession of Śrīranga. In the interval between the war of succession and the accession of Śrīranga, Bijapur aggressions through what is now the state of Mysore had become a normal feature and by opposing this aggression of the Mussalman power, Mysore grew gradually in power so that when Chāmarāja slowly absorbed the viceroyalty of Channapaṭṭaṇa, the empire looked on, as a strong Mysore was an effective barrier to a considerable extent against the aggressive activities of Bijapur. The empire had its own wars to

carry on to keep the aggressions of Golkoṇḍa in check. Golkoṇḍa was so far successful that during the first decade of Śrīranga's rule she had mastered possession of the whole of the coast region extending almost from Madras northwards, and the empire was confined to the central block of territory round Vellore and Chandragiri. Mysore stood firm perhaps as far east as the river Kāvēri. Between the frontier of Mysore and the actual boundary of the imperial territory such of it as remained under the emperor—was a stretch of country which had come into the possession of Bijapur under the administrative organization of one of their ablest viceroys, Shahji the Mahratta. It was about this time that Śrīranga matured his plan of uniting the remnants of the Vijayanagar empire with a view to effective action against the aggressive Muhammadan powers of the north, a policy which was not without elements of success in it, if only Mysore and Madura could have thrown in their lot loyally in support of the empire. The main question to decide therefore for the two great feudatories of Śrīranga was, what exactly was to the best interests of each in the circumstances. The alternatives before them were to throw in their lot with the empire and make a common stand, or each one to pursue his own policy to serve his own particular interests and leave the empire to its fate. Whichever of the alternatives happened to be chosen by the parties concerned, the ultimate idea must have been the ensuring of their existence and prosperity. Would Mysore live and thrive better as a member of the empire of Vijayanagar or as a separate state? Would Madura go on and prosper better as a member of the empire or by herself alone? These were the questions which had to be answered

in the adoption of a definite policy. In order to answer these satisfactorily, they would have had to estimate the possibilities of success of the combination to bring about which Śrīranga was then labouring. Any combination which the Hindu powers might effect would bring on as a natural consequence a combination of the two Muhammadan states of Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa. As a matter of fact through the exertions of Mir Jumla a marriage alliance had been brought about between the states, and the prospects were that they would adopt a common policy against the Hindu powers of the south, as it was absolutely necessary for them to do in regard to the Moghuls under Aurangzeb in the Dakhan. It might well have appeared to the southern feudatories that, in the face of this combination between the two Muhammadan states, the projected combination of the Hindu states had little chances of success; but at the time such a conclusion would be reckoning without Aurangzeb in the Dakhan. The period of the greatest activity of Aurangzeb against Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa was just opening. It would be very difficult to imagine that Mysore and Madura had not a clear notion of the impending danger against the Muhammadan states. A combination therefore of the Hindu states had in it the chances of success. The real difficulty against such a combination was the hostility of interests between Mysore and Madura. Could the two work together for a common purpose? That depended upon what the common purpose was and what the actual interests were which had to be sacrificed in the pursuit of this common object. The common object was the support of an empire which at the time might be regarded as effete. The interests that had to be sacrificed

were the possibility of aggression and acquisition of more territory by each of the principalities for herself. If this policy of aggrandizement could be given up, enlightened self-interest and patriotism alike would have clearly indicated the policy of union as the course of action to be adopted by the two rival principalities of Mysore and Madura. This was not apparently what appealed to them. The fugitive Śrīranga in Mysore was made use of, for only as a cloak for the aggrandizing schemes of Kanṭhīrava Narasa. We have so far come upon no evidence of the emperor having been in Mysore as a fugitive, but the Jesuit authorities state it clearly, and it is just possible in the circumstances that the Mysore authorities thought it more prudent to omit reference to this incident which could not redound to the honour of the ruler of Mysore for the time being. Kanṭhīrava Narasa's assumption of independence, at least an attempt at such, is datable at 1646, when he issued a grant without any reference to the ruling emperor for the time being. The year 1646, the year in which the empire was at its worst, Śrīranga had to stand a siege in Vellore by the whole of the Golkoṇḍa forces. The siege was raised through the active exertions of Śivappa Nāyaka, the general of Ikkēri. Perhaps it was this distress of the emperor, which gave the occasion for the attempt of Kanṭhīrava Narasa. It is soon after this that we hear of the dash of Bijapur upon Ginjee. This operation on the part of Bijapur, with Mysore in its flank, would be ordinarily difficult to understand unless it had the countenance or active support of Madura. The complaint of the Jesuits that Tirumala Nāyaka invited Bijapur probably has reference to this period. Mysore

18

adopted a policy which was hardly sympathetic to the empire and the imperial ambitions of Śrīranga. The Madura Nāyak adopted a policy of active support to the enemies of the empire for which the only explanation possible is his fear of the aggressions of Kanṭhīrava Narasa, and therefore of hostility of interests as against the empire. Thus the two powers concerned adopted a policy, which the hostility of interests between them dictated, and that policy proved unfavourable to the schemes of revival of the empire.

With the accession of Kanṭhīrava Narasa in Mysore, the Mysore frontier had been brought to be co-terminous with the northern frontier of Madura through the conquest of the Channapaṭṭaṇa viceroyalty in the previous reign. The first article of the foreign policy of Mysore must have been to keep on the watch along the whole length of the Bijapur frontier with a view to prevent the possible aggressions from that side. On the other side the frontier extended along the foot-hills from Dharmapuri and Ōmalūr through Dhārāpuram to Palghat, an uncertain frontier and open to constant attacks from the Nāyak of Madura. Therefore, so far as the Madura Nāyak was concerned, a most vulnerable and the really dangerous frontier happened to be this northern frontier and the most essential element of the foreign policy of the Madura Nāyak was to keep the ambitions of Mysore within bounds along this frontier. This would justify, if not necessitate, an attempt at concerted action between Bijapur and Madura as against Mysore. If, therefore, the emperor sought asylum in Mysore and if as the Jesuit letters say clearly Kanṭhīrava Narasa gave that asylum, the

Nāyak of Madura would be driven by that very act to seek the co-operation of Bijapur. That perhaps was what accounts for the somewhat strange and thoroughly unpatriotic policy that the great Nāyak of Madura pursued at this time. It was already pointed out that Śrīranga must have become a fugitive after the successful resistance to the Golkoṇḍa forces at Vellore. He must have sought and obtained asylum of Mysore some time after, and this must have brought about the combination between Tirumala and Bijapur, which exhibited itself in Bijapur activities round Ginjee. There was for the time Tanjore between the outermost possession of Bijapur in Ginjee and the Nāyak of Madura. This principality in the course of the next decade of Kanṭhīrava Narasa's rule managed to maintain its independent existence by keeping up a double front successfully against Madura and Bijapur. Kanṭhīrava Narasa was apparently very active between the period 1650 to 1659, a period during practically the whole of which the Moghul operations in the Dakhan were the most active under the personal direction of Aurangzeb. The activity of the Moghuls in the Dakhan must have diverted the attention of the Muhammadan states and left the immediate south open to the aggressive activity of Mysore. Kanṭhīrava Narasa took full advantage of this enforced quiet on his northern frontier by carrying on a séries of successful operations not only to secure his frontier along the line already indicated which, at a latter period of history, Sir Thomas Munro believed was the natural frontier separating Mysore from the territory of Madura. This assumption of hostility against Madura in a definite form by Kanṭhīrava made the position of the emperor in Mysore unacceptable

to him and made him move out of the shelter of Mysore to the protection of the Nāyak of Ikkēri ultimately. That gave a new stimulus to the forces hostile to Mysore, who could now find a justification for their hostility to Mysore by the pretext of their acting on behalf of the emperor. In the last years of the reign of Kanṭhīrava Narasa and of Tirumala Nāyaka of Madura, the wars became more frequent and were conducted with unusual barbarity. It is these wars which are described by contemporary European authorities as the "Wars of the Noses". It seems to be that the Mysorean forces set an example by cutting off the noses of their enemies, who fell into their hands alive or dead. The Madura forces retaliated with equal barbarity and on one occasion they are supposed to have chased the Mysore armies to the walls of the capital. It is even said that Kanṭhīrava Narasa himself was mutilated by being stripped of his nose? This so far rests upon the evidence of the Jesuit letters only. Such barbarities are not usually ascribed to either armies in connection with their other wars which were many and might even be said to be frequent. We have not come upon any record of this on the Indian side either by the one party or by other. It is impossible to say that such barbarities were not perpetrated as the Muhammadan historian Ferishta records a similar incident on the occasion of the siege of Bider by the Kuṭb-Shahi forces of Hyderabad. The "Naigwaries" as they are called are described to have brought in noses and ears of their victims in their nocturnal attacks, in all probability to earn the stipulated rewards, and no such is stated to have been offered either by Mysore or by Madura. We have however to remain content till more evidence speaks

definitely one way or the other. In his last war against Maduaa, Kanṭhīrava Narasa advanced up to the walls of Madura itself when Tirumala Nāyaka was in his last illness. The capture of Madura was averted by the timely intervention of the forces of Ramnad, and the Mysore forces were beaten back successfully within the frontiers of Mysore. It was after this and in the reign of Doḍḍa Dēvarāja of Mysore that a combination was brought about among the chieftains of the empire who took up ostensibly the cause of the emperor and made a joint attack upon Mysore. The series of hostile operations which became consequent on this culminated in the defeat of the combined forces at Erode in the last years of the reign of Dēvarāja when Chikkadēvarāja from his retirement at Tirukkaṇāmbi offered to lead the Mysore forces against their enemies. In this battle figured practically all the chieftains of the empire other than Mysore, and that was the last battle for the empire. The victory of Mysore in this battle put an end practically to the imperial ambitions of Śrīranga, and although he lived on for six or seven years more, he was able to do no more to bring him any nearer to the object that he set before himself in life. The revival of the empire therefore was baulked by the efforts of Mysore and Madura each of which pursued its own policy of ambition and aggression occasionally setting up the emperor as a cloak to their own ambitions. Both of them came out of the struggle victorious from the point of view of their individual interests. The empire was no more, and either of them could regard itself as an independent state. With the accession of Chikkadēvarāja, Mysore could regard herself independent both in form and in fact, and so

could Madura after the first few years of Tirumala's successor Chokkanātha.

The Moghul Conquest of Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa.—At the period to which we have arrived, the Vijayanagar empire as such was no more a political entity, the only two Hindu states which stood out of it were Mysore and Madura. The viceroyalties of Ginjee and Tanjore had been absorbed by the Mahrattas in the great viceroyalty of Shahji which at this period was in the hands of his second son Ekoji otherwise called Venkāji. The Mahratta power was rising to its zenith under Sivaji. The coast portion of the empire as far as Madras had been absorbed into the territory of the Sultans of Golkoṇḍa. The possessions of Bijapur were perhaps vaster than those of Golkoṇḍa, but she was troubled by the activities of Sivaji in the north-western part of her dominions. The Moghul activities in the Dakhan which began in the last years of the sixteenth century under Akbar had gradually been extending so that the Dakhan viceroyalty grew so much in extent and importance that it became the palatine viceroyalty of the great Moghuls throughout the long reign of Shah Jahan, who himself had been the Moghul viceroy of the Dakhan before. The Dakhan viceroyalty gradually extended its authority and ultimately succeeded in absorbing the territories of the Nizamshahi kings of Ahmadnagar and came into touch with the frontiers of both Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa in the north, and the Mahratta state of Sivaji in the west. In the last decade of Shah Jahan's reign Aurangzeb was the viceroy of his father and was always inclined to pursue a policy of active aggression against the Muhammadan

powers in particular, and of the rising power of the Mahrattas, though all through this period he under-estimated the character of the rising power of Sivaji. In all his activities he was hampered by cross-currents of princely interests at headquarters, so that Aurangzeb had not exactly his own way. He had therefore to pursue a policy of diplomacy as against the court, so shaping his course of action as to lead on to extorting the assent of the emperor to his definite policy of aggression, ending in the absorption of the two Muhammadan states. On the other side he had to pursue a policy of division of interests between the two southern states and sowing dissension among those loyal officers who were working in the interests of their masters, the Sultans of Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa. By persistent efforts, both diplomatic and war-like, Aurangzeb was very near the accomplishment of his object when he was called away to play his part in the war of succession which ended in his accession to power and the imprisonment of his father. The first twenty years of his reign were occupied with various other items of work which did not give him time enough to pay personal attention to the affairs of the Dakhan. The armies were sent under imperial princes and generals always in twos, owing to the haunting suspicion that his own sons might do unto him what he did to his father. Even where he sent generals he sent them in pairs always with the set purpose of assured division of interests. Therefore during these twenty years of his reign, an active policy in the Dakhan culminating in the absorption of the Muhammadan states was not possible. Another factor which contributed towards the same end was the ceaseless activity of the Mahratta Sivaji, and his

diplomacy which made him an ally of one of the Muhammadan states or the other or both, but always acknowledging some kind of allegiance to Bijapur. In this state of affairs, it seems to have dawned upon Sivaji that now that the Vijayanagar empire was passing out of political vision he might satisfy his own ambitions, religious and political, by assuming the role of the vanished Hindu emperor and standing before the Muhammadan *Padushah*, as the recognized head of the Hindu South. It is probably with a view to this that he fell in with the ideas of Raghunāth Narain Hanumante by whose influence he got into alliance with Golkoṇḍa, through its two Hindu ministers Madana and Akkana. Having secured his flank in this fashion Sivaji marched southwards as far as Tanjore with a view to gather the whole of the southern viceroyalty of his father and unite it with his own Mahratta state as part of a united empire, and, if success attended, of perhaps bringing the other Hindu states also into the scheme. It was probable that Aurangzeb caught a glimpse of this new ambition, and this knowledge perhaps gave point to his inveterate hostility to the Shiah Muhammadan states of the south. He therefore marched into the Dakhan at the head of the grand army and succeeded ultimately in defeating the Mahrattas and keeping them, at any rate, within bounds; and by then extinguishing the Muhammadan states of Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa he attained to his life ambition of an extension of the Moghul territories to the uttermost south.

In doing this he certainly put an end to the independent Muhammadan powers of Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa. What he was able to do against the Mahrattas only scotched the

Mahratta power, and perhaps left it temporarily disabled; but, by way of permanent subjection, he had not gone far. Of the cherished pretensions of Sivaji however of bringing all the Hindu states of the south under his ægis, Aurangzeb obviously had a glimpse as he seems to have received an embassy from Chikka Dēvarāja Woḍēyār of Mysore apparently after the fall of Bijapur. It may be a little before or after. After the fall of Golkoṇḍa he sent out an embassy demanding the submission of Madura. The emperor received the Mysore ambassador suitably and dismissed him after a six months' stay, having spent upon him, according to one account, 2,000 pagodas for the embassy recognizing Chikka Dēvarāja Woḍēyār as the ruler of Mysore, perhaps according to the Moghul notions, under the suzerainty of the great Moghul. Madura was far too remote even from Golkoṇḍa and was ruled by the Nāyak Ranga Krishṇa Muttuvīrappa, who had just come out of the leading strings of his grandmother, the Regent Mangammāl. According to the Jesuit records Aurangzeb sent an elephant fully caparisoned bearing on the howdah a slipper for the right foot. It was taken escorted by a suitable guard in procession, with the requisition that as soon as this slipper reached the frontiers of a Hindu state the ruler was expected to receive it with due form of royal ceremony as though he were receiving the emperor himself or his royal representative, take the slipper in procession to his Durbar, there offer Nazar and dismiss it in acknowledgment of his subordination to the emperor. It came to Śamayavarma, five miles north of Śrīrangam, which marked perhaps the frontier of the Madura Nāyak at the time, from which word was sent to the Nāyak. The Nāyak feigned illness and let the procession come on. It came to

the banks of the Vaigai, wherefrom another message was sent. Again he set up the same pretence and let the procession enter the fort and then the palace and come in front of his Durbar hall where he had assembled his court and was holding his Durbar in state. When the elephant arrived in the front court he got down from his throne, took the single slipper from the back of the elephant, and, shoving his right foot in, demanded angrily of the leaders of the embassy how it was that their *Padushah* could be so stupid as to send only one slipper, where a man required a pair to wear. The escort showed some fight, but they were easily beaten and driven away. According to the story Aurangzeb took no further step to enforce his authority over distant Madura after this dramatic episode. Aurangzeb in all probability knew that his predecessor the Tughlak Muhammad's empire extended as far as Madura and salved his conscience by this futile embassy and regarded himself as the emperor of the whole of Hindustan to the most distant south.

It becomes clear then that, out of the Vijayanagar empire which, as an empire, had now gone out of existence, there stood forth only two Hindu states, Mysore and Madura. Of these Mysore with a politic prudence, for which good precedents could be quoted, submitted to the inevitable by getting into diplomatic relation of feudal subordination, which was at the very most quite nominal and thus saved herself. Madura defied and for the time kept independent. Aurangzeb himself did not proceed to the conquest of Madura, but his generals and viceroys of the south never lost sight of these provinces of the late Hindu empire ; but the Nāyakship of Madura was actually put an

end to only when the Moghul viceroyalty of the Dakhan had become practically an independent Muhammadan state, and it was a feudatory of the Nizam who drove Queen Mīnākṣi of Trichinopoly to commit suicide. Safdar Jang and Chanda Saheb the representatives of the Nawab of Arcot together occupied Trichinopoly, and made the Queen virtually a prisoner; and it was Chanda Saheb who, by a perfidious act, drove the Queen to her destruction and the Nāyakship of Madura went out of existence thereafter.

This in brief is the sad tale in general outline of the glorious empire of Vijayanagar. In spite of the tragic end of one of her earliest and certainly the premier viceroyalty of Madura, a state composed of parts of three at least of her equally early viceroyalties, went to constitute the Hindu state of Mysore which maintains its existence even now with an episode of a Muhammadan usurpation which had well-nigh put an end to that Hindu state as well. It was British policy that was responsible for this Hindu restoration, and this notwithstanding, the state of Mysore under her enlightened ruler of to-day continues the glorious Hindu traditions of Krishṇadēvarāya and Vīra Baḻḻāḷa before him, in spite of the short parenthesis of about forty years which substituted Muhammadan for Hindu rule.

[*A lecture to the Mythic Society, Bangalore—published in the Society's Journal Vol. XIII, Parts 3 and 4, 1922–23*].

The Scholar King of Tanjore

When the empire of Vijayanagar was at the height of its glory in the reign of Krishṇadēvarāya, the southern provinces were under two Governors, as ever before under this dynasty. One of these corresponded roughly to the Pāṇḍya Country and the other to the Chōḻa. In the last years of the great king, it appears as though the governor of the latter set up in revolt under a governor who occupied high positions in the state under Krishṇa and seems to have enjoyed, to a considerable degree, his confidence. He was a Brahman by birth and was like many others of his time apparently both a valiant general and a very capable administrator. It is probable that this happened almost in the very last years of Krishṇa, who just before his death managed to defeat the rebel and got the province under his authority. King Krishṇa's death seems to have taken place immediately after. Very soon after his coronation at Tirupati, Achyuta had to undertake a southern campaign as far as the frontiers of Travancore, where this ex-Governor found asylum. When he brought this campaign to a successful close and carried his arms equally successfully across the whole of the empire to the banks of the Krishna, Achyuta made a re-distribution of the provinces, making Tanjore the headquarters of the Chōḻa Governorship (it seems to have been farther north probably at Tiruvaṇṇāmalai, before taking that part away from Madura), where

some few years before another old and trusted chief of Krishṇadēvarāya had already prepared the way for the foundation of the Nāyakship of Madura. This chief himself rebelled about the same time, and was brought a prisoner by his own son to the headquarters. In reward for this very loyal service, the son Visvanātha was appointed to the Governorship of his father. It appears as though Tanjore was taken from out of Visvanātha's Governorship and made the capital of the Chōḷa province of the empire.*

Achyuta appointed over this new province of Tanjore Chinna Chevva (Śiva), the husband of his wife's sister, as the first Governor. This Chief already rendered distinguished service to the emperor as Governor in the region of Tiruvaṇṇāmalai, where his name is still remembered for his vast benefactions to the temple. Among these may be mentioned the big *gōpuram* and the large tank in the temple there. He made similar additions to the temple at Vriddhāchalam, Śrīśailam and other places. In Tanjore itself he constructed a new fort called Śivaganga fort (pop. *Śivingi Kōṭe*), and the large fresh water tank, *Śivappa Nāyaniguṇṭa* (pop. *Śivaganga*).† His was a long reign of peace and prosperity. He was succeeded by a son of his by name Achyuta, who seems to have been a religious-minded man and devoted to the worship of Vishṇu, his particular devotion having been to Ranganātha at Śrīrangam. He is said to have maintained a thousand families in Mannārguḍi (*Champakāṭavī*), and was said to have been

* For a discussion of this see "Sources of Vijayanagar History," published recently by the University.

† Opus cit. pp. 255-56 and 285.

in the habit of weighing himself against gold annually (*Tulāpuruṣa*) at Bhavasthala (*Śivapuram*), distributing the gold among Brahmans or spending it in other forms of charity.*

To Achyuta and his queen Mūrtimāmba was born a son, whom he named Raghunātha. The prince was apparently one born rather late in life for the father, and appears to have been regarded as full of promise of greatness even as a baby. The father, the son and grandson had for their minister a Brahman scholar by name Gōvinda Dīkshita, who tells Raghunātha in the course of his work, by name *Sāhitya Sudhā*, that as a baby he was brought before the grandfather while all had assembled at court. At sight of the child Chevva turned to his minister and told him that the family would rise to great fame in this child, and the venerable Dīkshita took occasion to put in mind of Raghunātha of the greatness that his grandfather expected of him.† Raghunātha was given a splendid education as became his station in life. He became a great expert with the sword and the shield. He was a past-master in the training of elephants. He had mastered both the theory and the practice of music. He was a good poet both in Sanskrit and Telugu, and was a great scholar in the art of literature. When this education was completed his pious father directed that he might establish his claims "to the degree" by composing a poem on the 'Life of Śrī Krishṇa' as, in the opinion of Achyuta, "it was by works of literature alone that one could make himself immortal."

* Opus cit. p. 273. Sāhityaratnākara, Canto III.

† Opus cit. pp. 267-68.

Raghunātha proved his proficiency by writing his poem *Pārijātaharaṇam*. He is supposed to have completed the work in two *yāmas* (or six hours), and the scribes could only write it down with difficulty, as he dictated very rapidly. Greatly pleased with this literary performance the father did the scholar son the honour of "a bath in gold and precious stones" (*Kanaka Ratnābhiṣēka*).* After this Raghunātha wrote many works of which several have come down to us. One at least of his Sanskrit works was a treatise on music (*Sangīta Sudhā*). He also composed the *Rāmāyaṇa* in Telugu, which was considered so excellent that it was done into melodious Sanskrit again by a poetess of his court known to us by the title *Madhuravāṇi*.† Both Yagñanārāyaṇa Dīkshita, the author of the *Sāhityaratnākara* and a son of Gōvinda Dīkshita, and Rāmabhadrāmba the author of the epic poem *Raghunāthābhyudayam* acknowledged their obligations to him almost as their *guru*.‡ In music he is given credit for having invented new *rāgas* and new *tāḷas*. What is more than all this he is the author of the new *mēla*, a mechanical arrangement of the Vīṇa, which enables the use of the instrument without a seperate adaptation of the stops for each *rāga* separately.§ We know that this device was wanting in regard to the instrument up to the time of the great king Krishṇadēvarāya. His poet laureate Allasani Peddana says, in the

* A person thus honoured is made to sit down upon a seat first. After a commendatory speech or address, coins, or gems and jewels, or a mixture is poured over till it covered the person completely, the precious heaps becoming the property of the person thus honoured.

† Opus cit. pp. 267 and 270.

‡ Opus cit pp. 275 and 284.

§ Opus Extract 89.

Manucharita, that the women who had adjusted the instrument for the rāga *nāṭṭai*, went to sleep while still playing on the instrument and left it adjusted to this *rāgam* (tune). When the morning breeze blew upon it, it began to intune, somewhat out of tune for the time, when the suitable tune should have been *dēśātchi*. This is a clear indication that the mechanical device was not then in use. But the invention of this device is ordinarily ascribed to another son of the minister Gōvinda Dīkshita, known by the name Venkaṭēśa Makhi ; but in Raghunātha's own work *Sangīta Sudhā* a courtier of his actually says that the invention was due to Raghunātha himself. It is just possible the idea was the king's and the actual adaptation was due to the expert pandit, Venkaṭēśa of his court.* After the completion of this education, Achyuta, the father wanted that the son should make extensive conquests of territory, and gave him therefore thorough bred horses, elephants, some of his own jewels and districts. Just about this time his services were called for by the emperor, and this gave the occasion for his baptism of fire.

Raghunātha must have been born in the last years of the 16th century. Somewhat earlier in the century took place the epoch-making battle of Talikota, which subverted practically the empire of Vijayanagar and made the city untenable, as the headquarters of the empire. Tirumala the next brother of Rāma who fell in battle shifted the capital to Penugoṇḍa, and continued for about six more years to rule, like his late elder brother, in the name of Sadāśivarāya. Soon after A. D. 1570, either because

* Opus cit pp. 270-71. Sāhityaratnākara, Canto V.

Sadāśiva died or because Tirumala thought it unnecessary any longer to preserve the fiction, Tirumala began to rule as emperor. When he died he was succeeded by his eldest surviving son Śrīranga, who left behind him no son. The throne then came to be occupied about A.D. 1585 by Venkaṭapati or Venkaṭādri his youngest brother, the next one Rāma having died in the meanwhile, as viceroy of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam. This emperor continued to rule till A.D. 1614.

Since the battle of Talikota and the evacuation of Vijayanagar, the Muhammadan trouble did not cease. It was just about that time that Akbar was moving into the Dakhan from the north and that had to be attended to. The attention of the five Bahmani Sultans therefore had to be divided. The two more important states of the north Berar and Ahmadnagar were in imminent danger by this advance. They therefore had to occupy themselves with their position exposed to the northern attack. The empire of Vijayanagar was therefore left to be disposed of, as best they might, between the southern states of Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa. These two states came to an understanding as between themselves. Bijapur had for its sphere the part of Vijayanagar above the Ghats, and Golkoṇḍa that part of it below the Ghats. It was open to each of these states to acquire as much of the Hindu territory as they could and keep to itself what it actually acquired. Thus wars from this side were pretty frequent, and Penugoṇḍa and places round about it had to suffer the perpetual harrying of the Sultans of Golkoṇḍa. It was on the occasion of one of those advances by the Muhammadans

towards Penugoṇḍa that Venkaṭapati sent a message to Achyuta of Tanjore calling for his assistance, with the specific request, as our authorities have it, that the Tanjore forces might be sent under the command of the young prince Raghunātha. In accordance with imperial orders Raghunātha marched at the head of the Tanjore army and helped to beat off the Muhammadan attack upon Penugoṇḍa itself. His services were so highly appreciated by the emperor that the emperor was quite prepared to give him anything he might choose to ask by way of favour. Raghunātha made use of this influence in favour of Krishṇappa Nāyaka of Ginjee who had been thrown into prison by the emperor for treacherous conduct in his Governorship. Raghunātha's intervention was effective, Krishṇappa Nāyaka was set free and in gratitude, for this good office, the Nāyak of Ginjee gave one of his daughters in marriage to Raghunātha.* Raghunātha returned victorious to his father with the grateful testimony of the emperor, and resided in the court of his father for some time.

One day when old Achyuta was holding court, information came to him that at the gate of the palace were some distinguished ladies, beseeching asylum of him. The king learnt, on sending out ministers to find out what exactly was the trouble, that they were exiles from Jaffna, members of the family of the king of Jaffna, recently dispossessed of his kingdom by the Portuguese, who treacherously occupied the capital and turned out the ruler. They said they had already had a taste of the sweets of the assistance of the

* Opus cit p. 285 Raghunāthābhyudayam of Rāmabhadrāmba, Sarga VII.

Rājas of Tanjore, and could see no better asylum than that of Achyutarāja. Achyuta ordered a portion of his palace to be vacated for their occupation and took counsel of the venerable minister Gōvinda Dīkshita, and his own young son Prince Raghunātha, pointing out to them how troublesome the Portuguese had become, and how, in spite of his having turned them out from Negapatam recently, they still continued their predatory habits *. The old minister pointed out that the Portuguese were indeed troublesome, but that the trouble could easily be put an end to by putting a feudatory chief, who was their mainstay on the Tanjore coast, out of power of mischief. The chief was the *Śoḻaga* chieftain who had ensconced himself in an island at the mouth of the Coleroon in a strongly built and well-protected fort. He was a source of great trouble to the inhabitants of the locality. He carried away innocent women into captivity;† he was tyranical and oppressive to the *kaḷḷars* of the locality (*kaḷamāḷ*). He sometimes captured people, tied them up in bags, and after beating them well with pestles, threw them as food for his crocodiles in the moat of his fortress. He tortured people by driving needles through the roots of the hair. An atrocious tyrant like this should be put an end to first, and that would effectively destroy the support on which the Portuguese rely for their predatory success. "Destroy the *Śoḻaga*, you will destroy the Portuguese therewith" concluded Gōvinda Dīkshita. Achyuta agreed to this counsel and was advised by the old minister to abdicate in favour of the son, who could carry on the war with far

* Opus cit p. 270. Sāhityaratnākara, Cantos V and X.

† Rāmabhadrāmba's Raghunāthābhyudayam, Sarga VI. Opus cit. p. 286.

greater effect than the old man that he was, could. Gōvinda Dīkshita gave for his reason for this advice that the war was not likely to begin and end with the *Śoḻaga* alone or the Portuguese. He said the Pāṇḍyas had long been harbouring ill-will to the Tanjore family. They had got into an alliance with both the Portuguese and the *Śoḻaga.** What was worse, Krishṇappa Nāyaka of Ginjee had, "according to his nature, turned out faithless again and had got into alliance with the Nāyak of Madura and his allies. This combination requires vigorous action for which a younger man on the throne would be more suitable than the pious minded old man that he was. Achyuta agreed with his minister and ordered the anointment of his son on the Wednesday following.†

In the meanwhile spies sent into the Madura country had arrived with news of the movements of the combination formed by the Nāyaka of Madura. They pointed out that the armies of the Madura Nāyak, with a contingent of the Portuguese to help him,‡ the Nāyak of Ginjee and various other chieftains were on the move towards the island of Śrīrangam. Orders were immediately issued for special spies being sent to find out exactly what these movements meant; and in a short while, the messengers from Yāchama Nāyaka arrived with the information that a

---

* Sāhityaratnākara, Sarga X. Opus cit p. 271. Also Purchas : His Pilgrims X, Ch. vii.

† Sāhityaratnākara, Sarga X. Opus cit p. 273.

‡ Sāhityaratnākara, Sarga XIII. The passage here refers to the Portuguese by the terms *Pārasikas* and *Turuṣkas*. That the reference is to the Portuguese is quite obvious both from the actual description and the corresponding passage of Raghunāthābhyudayam calling them "*Parangis*".

revolution had taken place at the imperial headquarters at Penugoṇḍa, and these movements were all in consequence thereof. Venkaṭapatirāya, the emperor, had died recently. Immediately after his death, his ministers unanimously nominated the younger of the two sons of his late brother Rāmarāya, the viceroy of Srirangapatam, as his successor. This was *Śrīranga Chikkarāya.* Gobbūri Jaggarāya who was related to one of the queens of Venkaṭapati did not approve of this arrangement and brought about a revolution. Jaggarāya's relation, among the queens of Venkaṭa, seems to have had a putative son, whom the emperor Venkaṭa set aside perhaps designedly. Jagga naturally enough took up the cause of his relative and pretending to serve Śrīranga, the actual successor, managed to have him, his wife, and all his children assassinated. While the arrangements for this atrocity were in progress, a faithful chieftain Yāchama Nāyaka got wind of the affair, and managed by a stratagem to get one of the sons out by a secret passage through the good offices of a washerman. This boy, Yāchama took charge, and, finding the great majority of the chieftains of the empire inclined to support Jaggarāya, was on the march towards Tanjore to ask for the support of Achyuta. Both Yāchama and Jaggarāya were marching southwards from Penugoṇḍa, Yāchama anxious to reach Tanjore before it was too late, and Jaggarāya anxious to effect a junction with his allies and interpose himself between Tanjore and Yāchama. The messengers having reported this called for immediate action to meet the imperial fugitive.*

---

* Rāmabhadrāmba's Raghunāthābyudayam, Sarga VIII. Opus cit. p. 287.

Raghunātha made up his mind at once. He marched forward to Kumbhakonam, received Yāchama and the imperial fugitive, and had the anointment of the young prince celebrated at Kumbhakonam. Then instead of coming back he dashed forward to the mouth of the Coleroon and after a short fight overthrew the *Śoḻaga* and destroyed him at a time when he could get no assistance from any of his allies. He sent forward an army across to Jaffna to dislodge the Portuguese from there. Having done this he marched back and returned to headquarters.* In the meanwhile information was brought to him that the Pāṇḍyan army and the army of Ginjee had effected a junction with the traitor Jaggarāya, and his allies near the island of Śrīrangam. The traitor Jagga with a view to making it easy for him to unite with the allies apparently broke the anicut on the Kāvēri, and the combined allies were making arrangements to march upon Tanjore itself. Raghunātha ordered the movement of his whole army and set forward towards *Paḷavānēri*, which he made his headquarters camp.† He vowed before starting that he would destroy all his enemies and place the young emperor upon the throne, building to his favourite god Rāmabhadra a temple at the headquarters of his enemy after his victory. He would destroy the traitor Jaggarāya for the perfidious act of having broken the anicut of the Kāvēri, and would rebuild it with the heads of his defeated enemies.‡ He

* Sāhityaratnākara, Sarga XIII and Rāmabhadrāmba's Raghunāthābhyudayam, Sarga VIII. Opus cit pp. 274-288.

† Rāmabhadrāmba's Raghunāthābhyudayam, Sargn IX. Opus cit p. 289.

‡ Sāhityaratnākara, Sargas XIII and XIV. Opus cit p. 283.

mounted his elephant Rāmabhadra, carrying the state howda called *Vijayagaruḍādri*, followed on either side by the town officers and the officers of his bodyguard. He carried on his own howda a young son of his, Rāmadhadra by name; the elephant following him carried the young Emperor Rāmarāya. These were followed by as many as 32 subordinate chieftains and officers.* The two armies came into contact with each other at a village, now called Tohūr, on the south bank of the Kāvēri about two miles from the Grand Anicut. The battle began with an artillery duel, then Raghunātha charged with his cavalry in semi-circular formation, closely followed by his infantry. This attack proved irresistable. The Pāṇḍya troops which were the first attacked, broke and fled. Jaggarāya advanced forward and placed himself between Raghhnātha's troops and the fugitive Pāṇḍya. Jaggarāya fared no better and fell in the fight. The whole of Jagga's army was destroyed. That was the decisive part of the battle, both the Pāṇḍya and the Nāyak of Ginjee retired each to his own territory and projected a course of warfare afterwards. Raghunātha having won the victory marched down as far as Trivadi, and sending forward troops to bring Krishṇappa Nāyaka of Ginjee to his senses he returned to Tanjore.† The Emperor was restored to his position and the empire saved for the time being. During the period of Rāma's reign separate actions had to be fought against each one of the chiefs to bring him back to loyalty. This succeeded in great part; but the empire had suffered vital injuries, and had

* Vijayarāghava's Raghunāthābhyudayam. Opus cit. Extract 899.

† Rāmabhadrāmba's: Raghunāthābyudayam, Sarga X. Opus cit. pp. 280-9.

advanced too far towards dismemberment, to be united again into one compact state. Two more rulers succeeded and held their positions more or less precariously, and after something like 30 years of the date of this battle the empire actually broke to pieces, a number of independent states coming into existence from out of this dismembered empire. One of these springing as a small state from the viceroyalty of Srirangapatam absorbed that viceroyalty itself and continues the traditions of the rule of Vijayanagar in the present state of Mysore.

Some time after returning to Tanjore from this victorious campaign, Raghunātha held a competition, it would appear, among the ladies of his Court, several of whom could compose poetry in the four kinds. They were also expert in resolving various literary puzzles. Some of them could compose a hundred verses in "an hour," and write poetry in 8 languages. One lady of the Court by name Rāmabhadrāmba was accorded the first place in this and was installed as the "empress among the poets', (*Sāhitya-sāmrājya*) which probably involved the honour of a *Kanakābhiṣēka* (bathing in gold). He also held an exhibition of musical proficiency along with this.*

Among the building works of Raghunātha must be mentioned temples to Rāmaswāmi at Rāmēśvaram, Śrīrangam and Kumbhakonam, large additions to the temples at Mannārguḍi, Pasupatikōvil, Uppiliappankōvil, Śrīrangam; he built the great *gōpura* of Kumbhēśvara temple and he founded many *agrahāras*. He maintained the charities of

* Rāmabhadrāmba's Raghunāthābhyudayam, Sargas XI and XII. Opus cit p. 291.

his father, which were very vast in the whole of the kingdom.* *Raghunātha died in 1626 according to the Icelandic traveller Plafssons,*† and was succeeded by his son Vijayarāghava.

This summary account of the accomplishments and deeds of Raghunātha shows him a scholar, patron and warrior, and so much of his life could be recovered as the result of his own patronage to learning as well as that of his family. The account given above is based principally on two works on Raghunātha, *Raghunāthābhyudayam*, a Sanskrit epic of Rāmabhadrāmba the famous Court poetess referred to above. This is supplemented in important particulars by the Telugu work, *Raghunāthābhyudayam*, written by his own son Vijayarāghava Nāyaka. There are numbers of other works which throw a great deal of light upon the history not only of Raghunātha but of the whole of the Tanjore family. In regard to Raghunātha's history, however, it is the *Sāhityaratnākara* of Yegñanārayaṇa Dīkshita, and the *Sangīta Sudhā* of Gōvinda Dīkshita that are of very great value. Among the many charities of his son Vijayarāghava Nāyaka is one, which was meant in honour of his father, an *agrahārā* granted to Brahmans, which went by the name Raghunāthapura‡ Agrahāra, the *agrahāra* in which I happened to be born. The *agrahāra* got fortified in the generation immediately following, and bears the name of the great Mahratta viceroy of Bijapur, Shahji, the father of a still greater son Sivaji. That village goes now by the name Śākkōṭṭai

* Sāhitya Sudhā. Opus cit pp. 267-8.

† The life of Jon Plafssons, Hakluyt Society, Vol. II, p. 118.

‡ Vijayarāghava's Raghunāthābhyudayam, p. 255.

contracted from Shahjikōṭe. It is with some little personal satisfaction that I close the life of this enlightened ruler of Tanjore, who was scholar, patron and ruler, all in one, with achievements in each of these which would compare honourably with those of great rulers, in these separate departments.

[*A lecture delivered before the South Indian Association with the Hon'ble the Advocate General Mr. S. Srinivasa Aiyangar in the Chair.*]

APPENDIX.

The Sanskrit texts referred to is published in the course of this article.

Note 2.

शोणाद्रिनाथं सुपदास्समेत्य पुरास्समस्तास्सुकरं भजन्ताम् ।
इत्येव यो हेममयं महेन्द्र पुरातिगङ्गो पुरमाततान ॥७॥

वियत्तले यो विबुधाग्रसीम्नि नित्यं नटन्त्यां निजकीर्तिनृत्याम् ।
स्तम्भं यथा वृद्धगिरौ चकार स्फुरन्मणीगोपुरमिन्दुमौळेः ॥८॥

श्रीशैलनाथस्य सितांशुमौळेः प्राकारसोपानपरम्परादीन् ।
स्वनामचिह्नान्सकलोपचारान् चक्रे स्थिरं यो नृपसार्वभौमः ॥९॥

महान्ति दानानि मरुद्वृधायाः तटान्तिके दैवतमन्दिराणि ।
महाग्रहारांश्च महीमहेन्द्रश्चकार यश्शाश्वतधर्मकेतुः ॥१०॥

Note 3.

अनर्घरत्नाङ्कितमेष भूषणं वितार्य रङ्गाधिपतेर्विशांपतिः ।
अनुत्तमं रत्नममुष्यकौस्तुभात् परंनहीति प्रणुनोद दुष्प्रथाम् ॥४७॥

अलंक्रियाप्रेमयदब्धिकन्यकाविभोः प्रसिद्धं तदयं विशांपतिः ।
अमुष्यरङ्गाधिपतेस्समर्पयन् अपूरयद्भूरिविभूषणानिसः ॥४९॥

ससम्भ्रमं विरचितचम्पकाटवीसहस्रभूविबुधकुडुम्बसम्भृते ।
भवस्थलेप्रतिशरदप्रवर्तितस्फुरत्तुलापुरुषयशोविशोभते ॥७०॥

Note 4.

तत्रेन्दिरामन्दिरनामधेये सभाविशेषे सहमन्त्रिवर्गैः ।
कविप्रकाण्डैरपि काळिदासमयूरसौमिल्लमुगदेश्यैः ॥

कर्णाटकान्ध्रद्रमिलप्रबन्धनिर्माणविद्यानिपुणैश्चकैश्चित् ।
वाग्गेयकारप्रमुखैरनेकैः विचित्रगीतादिकलाप्रवीणैः ॥

आस्तेऽधिभद्रासनमच्युतेन्द्रतनूभवश्रीरगुनाथभूपः ।
आशतिमेनां शिरसा प्रगृह्य प्रावेशयत्सोऽपि बुधान्समस्तान् ॥

पूर्वं समेता वयमत्र युष्मत्पितामहंचेव्वमहीमहेन्द्रम् ।
आशीर्भिरानन्दयितुं तदग्रे त्वय्याददाने खुरळीषु केळीम् ॥
तदा भवन्तं स विलोक्य हर्षान् अस्मान्मुदा वाचमिमामवोचत् ।
अस्माकमेतेन भवेत्प्रतिष्ठा धर्तुं समर्थश्च स एष राज्यम् ॥
आशीर्विशेषाच्चिनचेव्व नेतुः आसीरिदानीमधिकस्ततोऽपि ॥

Note 6.

श्रीपारिजाताहरणप्रबन्धं चित्रं च वाल्मीकिचरित्रकाव्यम् ।
तथाऽच्युतेन्द्राभ्युदयं गजेन्द्रमोक्षं चरित्रं च नळस्य चित्रम् ॥
श्रीरुक्मिणीकृष्णविवाहयक्षगानं प्रबन्धानपि नैकभेदान् ।
निर्माय वाग्भिर्निपुणार्थभाग्भिः विद्वत्कवीनां विदधासि हर्षम् ॥

Sarga V.

रामो दशस्त्ववतरेष्वपि राजतेऽसा-
वद्यापि कीर्तिवपुरादिकवेर्निबन्धात् ।
तस्माद्विधेहि समतामवधेहि ताव-
द्यत्नं विभोर्यदुपतेश्चरितप्रबन्धम् ॥२७॥

माकन्दकन्दळदमन्दमरन्दबन्धु
त्वं पारिजातहरणं त्वरया निबन्द्धुम् (?) ॥

यामद्वयेन यदुनेतरि पारिजात-
माजीहरत्सरसमच्युतभूपसूनुः ॥
काव्यं तदत्र विबुधैस्तु कथं कथं चि-
दालेखि चित्रमवधाय फणीन्द्रकल्पैः ॥३०॥

रावं वदंस्तनयमेष कृपारसौघैः
जाताभिषेकमपि तं जगती बिडौजाः ।
तत्राभ्यषिञ्चत मणीभिरसौ सभाया-
मासीत्स एव वसुधेशपटाभिषेकः ॥३५॥

अस्याच्युताभ्युदयपूर्वशतप्रबन्ध-
कर्तुर्महीतलशतक्रतुरात्मजस्य ।
अ (श्वो) रसानि गजतां स्वविभूषणानि
देशान् बहूंश्च दयमानमना व्यतारीत् ॥३७॥

जातु क्षमामथ विजापयितुं समस्तां
नानानरेन्द्रविधृतां निजनन्दनेन ।

Note 7. कविबुधगायकाभिमतकल्पनकल्पतरो ।
जय करुणासनाथ रघुनाथ जनाधिपते ॥

Note 10.

अत्रान्तरे भूपकुलावतंसः तुण्डीरनाथं परिदूयमानम् ।
काराश्रितं तत्प्रमदा कदम्बात् आकर्णयद्दीनजनावलम्बः ॥७२॥

तदत्ययोवार्तधराधिनाथः रक्षैकतानो रघुनाथभूपः ।
काराश्रितं कृष्णपनायकं तं व्यमोचयद्वेङ्कटदेवरायात् ॥७३॥

तुण्डीरनाथस्स्वधूरनाथः प्रणम्य भक्त्या पदयोरमुष्य ।
करं स्वसुर्ग्राहयति स्म सद्यो रक्षाधुरीणं रघुनाथमेनम् ॥७४॥

Note 11.

सञ्चिन्तयन्सनृपतिश्रवसोरतानीत्
कोलाहलं कमपि भूपकुलाङ्गनानाम् ॥६५॥

भोरक्ष रक्षसहसा भुवनैकवीरविद्राविताञ्जिजषदाद्भिमतैस्वयस्मान् ।
नेपाळनेतुरवरोधनितम्बवत्यः पत्यावयं पदमिताश्शरणं तवेति ॥

कार्पण्यगर्भमवकर्ण्यतु कर्णरन्ध्रनाराचकल्पमुदितं नतमध्यमानाम् ।
आधारमावहदपारकृपारसार्द्रं वाचां हृदैपनिमिषंवसुधासुधांशुः ॥६७॥

ते नागपट्टणगतेन मया निरस्ताः
पूर्वं समेत्य पुरमस्य समुद्रखेयम् ।
नेपाळभूविभुमतो निरकासयन्कि
भङ्क्ष्यामि तत्पुनरहं युधि पारसीकान् ॥६८॥

नेपाळभूविभुमसौ निजगर्भगेह-
द्वारि स्थितं द्रुतमुपेत्य तमित्युवाच ।
प्राक्पीतशेषरुधिरान्युधि पारसीक-
प्राणान् हरेयुरधुना तुतराव बाणाः ॥६९॥

नेपाळक्षोणिपालं सपदिनिजपदभ्रंशितं पारसीकैः
प्रत्यासन्नं वितन्वन्प्रबलभुजमहो नर्तयित्वासमित्याम् ।
भूमीपालश्चिरायागमयत समयं भूभृतो जैलयालां
सर्वे कुर्वन्ति यस्मिञ्जलनिधिशयनस्वापमुद्रादरिद्रे ॥७३॥

Sarga X.

ससुतो वसुधासुधाकरोऽसौ सह गोविन्दमखीन्दुना सभायाम् ।
समगादथ तत्र गोत्रभेदे सजयन्तो गुरुणा यथामराणाम् ॥

Note 12. Raghunāthābhyudayam.

भूमीश्वरैर्जगति विट्ठलराजपूर्वैः अन्यैरमेयबलशालिभिरप्यजेयः ।
आराध्य भैरवमवाप्य वरं दुरापं शूराग्रणिश्चरति चोळगनामधेयः ॥७॥

अधिपयोधिदशास्यइवापरः प्रबलबाहुबलः परदुस्सहः ।
जगदशेषमिदं जगतीपतेक्षुभितमेव करोति सचोलगः ॥८॥

कथमिदं कथयामि कृपानिधे शृणु नृपाल सचोलगरावणः ।
प्रतिदिनं हरते पतिदेवताः परवधूरनिवार्य पराक्रमः ॥९॥

श्रुत्वा तदा सदसि चोलगदुष्टचेष्टामापाद्यभू दिविषदामभयप्रदानम् ।
वीराग्रणीस्स रघुनाथविभुस्समस्तैः अस्तूयत द्विजवरैरतिमोदमानैः॥१२॥

Note 13. Sāhityaratnākara, Sarga X.

नृपचन्द्रनृशंसवृत्तिरास्ते स तथा संप्रति चोळको धरायाम् ।
प्रवदन्ति जना यथा मुनीनां प्रवरं हन्त दशाननं चरित्रैः ॥१६॥

अभवद्बहुकालकूटबाधानभवस्तोयनिधेश्चिरस्तनो यः ।
अधुना स निजान्तरैकवासं स हतश्चोळकमस्य साधनैव ॥१७॥

पथिकान्मिळितः पथिष्वजस्रं बत गोणीकृतभस्त्रिकासु बद्ध्वा ।
मुसलैस्स विभो मुहुः प्रहार्य क्षिपति ग्राहमुखेषु निर्निमित्तम् ॥१८॥

वनदंष्ट्रिमिराहता त्वदीयैकळमाळिल्यभिधायिनां जनानाम् ।
अधिरोपयतेऽधिरोमकूपं शितसूचीरिह पाययत्यजस्रम् ॥२०॥

इयता वचसा यदेकदेशोऽप्यधुनाऽभिहितस्तदस्य सर्वम् ।
चरितं हतकस्य शक्यतेतन्नमयाकर्णयितुं नमश्शिवाय ॥२१॥

भवता नरपालकेन्द्रभग्ने निहते चोळगनाम्नि नीतिमार्गात् ।
प्रभवो न भवन्ति पारसीकाः पुरि नेपाळविभुं पुनर्निरोद्धुम् ॥२२॥

Note 14. Sāhityaratnākara, Canto X.

नृपधूर्वहतां निजेतनूजे वसुधावास्तटिनीवरावृतायः ॥२॥ ।
वितनुष्वरणेष्वसौ विशङ्को विमतानाशुविनाशयत्ययत्नम् ॥६०॥

विजितावहवो विशायधीशाः बहुधाभोजिवसुन्धराप्यशेषा ।
विदुषामपि संभृतं व्यतारि द्रविणं किं परमस्ति किं विधेयम् ॥६२॥

परमेतदिहावशिष्यते मे परमेस्मिन्नचगुनाथ नाम्निपुत्रे ।
अवनीभरमाकलय्यशत्रूनविनीतानमुना विजापयिष्ये ॥६३ ॥

तदमुंधरणीतलेन्द्रतायां अभिषिञ्चत्वमपि द्रुतं विकीर्णैः ।
सविधं ममकैश्चनक्षितीन्द्रैः सहकर्णाटनृपात्मजं नयस्व ॥६४॥

सौम्ये भाविनि वासरे शुभतरे शौण्डीर्यमुख्यैर्गुणैः
प्रख्यातं रघुनाथनायकममुं प्रौढापदानं सुतम् ।
क्षिप्रं त्वं चतुरर्णवीपरिवृतक्षोणीतलप्राभवे
कुर्याः कौतुकतोऽभिषिक्तमखिलैर्गोविन्दयज्वाग्रणीः ॥१०३॥

Note 15.

चारो नेत्राचोदितसप्रजानां दृष्ट्वा शत्रुक्ष्मापतीन्दत्तवृत्तीन् ।
वक्तुं वेगादागतो वासधाम्नः कक्ष्यामग्र्यामस्य काममप्यवाप ॥७॥

आपूर्यान्तः प्रौढलोहाग्नियन्त्रैष्वाविघ्नानो यत्समीपेसमीरः ।
सख्या स्वस्यारातिसैन्यक्षिपायां उद्योगित्वं नित्यमुद्धुष्यतीव ॥८॥

हस्तग्राह्या पारलोहाग्नियन्त्रकैर्हालास्वादनाघूर्णिताक्षैः ।
सन्नद्धैर्या सन्ततं पारसीकैः उत्साहैर्वा सप्रतीकैरुपेता ॥९॥

वेद्यां तस्यां भूपतेर्वेत्रहस्तैः द्विवैरेव स्थापितान्द्दप्तवृत्तान् ।
कालस्येवालोकयत्कालभेदान् सोऽयं भीतो नित्यशुष्कांस्तुलष्कान् ॥

सद्यो मृष्टस्वच्छताम्रोपमानैः दीर्घश्मश्रुश्रेणिदीर्तैर्महद्भिः ।
शून्याळीकैरक्षतश्रोत्रयुग्मैः वक्त्रैः क्रूरान्वक्रितभ्रूकुटीकैः ॥१५॥

उद्भ्रान्ताक्षान्लोहितोष्णीषबन्धान् ताम्रच्छायैस्सावतंसान्गरुद्भिः ।
वज्रप्रायैर्वर्मितान्वारबाणैः निस्ताम्बूलान्मद्यनित्यावलिप्तान् ॥१६॥

कत्यालम्बिप्रौढकौक्षेयसक्तं तूणीभारं बिभ्रतो दुर्विदग्धान् ।
सव्येनोच्चैः पाणिना शार्ङ्गचापं द्वित्रानन्येनापि तीक्ष्णान्पृषत्कान् ॥१७॥

Note 16. Raghunāthābhyudayam, Sarga VIII.

विष्णोः पदं श्रयति वेंकटदेवराये सर्वे तदीयसचिवा युवराजसूनुम् ।
भद्रासने तदनुभूभरणाय तूर्णं श्रीरङ्गरायनृपशेखरमभ्यषिञ्चन् ॥२६॥

तस्मिन्महीं शासति तं समस्ताः पुरातना भूपतयो भजन्तः ।
द्रोहं विधातुं द्रुतमेव तस्मै जनाधिनाथाय सजग्गराजः ॥२७॥

सानुजो निशि सजग्गमहीशः पार्थिवस्य भवनं परिवेष्ट्य च ।
भूपतिं तदनु पुत्रकळत्रैः निर्घृणो निहतमातनुते स ॥२८॥

तनयेषु नृपाळतस्यकंचित् शिशुमाप्तो रजकस्समेत्यशीघ्रम् ।
अनयन्नगराद्बहिर्निशायां अतिचौर्याद्विषतामनक्षिलक्ष्यम् ॥२९॥

केचिदेनमुपगम्यकृतज्ञाः पार्थिवास्तदहितान्तप्रतिकारम् ।
नेतुमक्षमतयान्नृपतेऽस्मान् प्रापयन्परिसरंभवदीयम् ॥३०॥

आपदां पदमनन्यशरण्यं राजपुत्रयवनीरमणस्त्वम् ।
सिंहपीठमधिरोपयशीघ्रं जग्गराजमपिसंहरयुद्धे ॥३॥

Note 17. Raghunāthābhyudayam, Canto IX.

अथाखिलाशाविजयोत्सुकायमहीभुजे चोळगभानहन्त्रे ।
नेपाळभूमौ निजकार्यभागं व्यजिज्ञपम्मन्त्रयतोविनीत्या ॥१॥

विनाप्रगल्भं विमताञ्जिगीषुः महीपतिस्तत्रमहांबुराशौ ।
तरीभिरेतत्तरणायतूर्णं अकल्पयत्सेतुमनन्यसाध्यम् ॥१२॥

आरम्यवेलालभितोम्बुराशेः मनीषिणां सत्वरमापतन्तीम् ।
आलोक्यतामाहवकौतुकोत्कैः अभाविनेपाकनृपालवर्गैः ॥१४॥

अयोमयाभिर्नळिकावलीभिः अपाङ्गकोणैरपि रोषशोणैः ।
अवाकिरं स्त्वग्निकणान्विपक्षा भूपालसैन्येषु पुरःस्थितेषु ॥८॥

परंगियोधप्रहितैः क्षुरप्रैः विभोघभूम्नेवचमूर्तिहस्ता ।
परागजातं किमुपद्मजातं प्रगल्भते शोषविधौ पयोधे ॥१९॥

आलोकितुं स्थातुमशक्नुवन्तो भयात्पलायन्त परंगिवंश्याः ॥२१॥

धनानि दारैस्सममार्जितानि शस्त्राणि शौर्येण समं धृतानि ।
विहाय सर्वे भयविह्वलास्ते निधौ जलानां न्यपतन्सवेगम् ॥२२॥

Note 18. Raghunāthābhyudayam, Canto IX.

सिंहासनद्रोहविधानशीलाः जिहांसवस्तं क्षितिपालबालकम् ।
तुण्डीरपाण्ड्यादिमदुष्टभूपैः विचारयन्ते विपदं जगत्याम् ॥२५॥

अदभ्रवीचीसमदभ्रकल्पगन्धर्वरेखान्वितगन्धनागः ।
महारवस्तस्य महीसुधांशोः चमूसमूहस्समजृम्भताग्रे ॥२६॥

आत्मीयसैन्याह्वतचन्दनौघं पाटीरशैलं यशसा प्रसाद्य ।
अथ प्रतीच्यामरिराजधानीं तोपूरभिख्यामगमत्स तूर्णम् ॥२७॥

Note 19. Sāhityaratnākara.

छिन्नैर्जग्गनृपादिबाहुजनुषां सेतुं शिरः कूर्परैः
कावेर्यां युधि बन्धयामि सुदृढं कामं तथाहं भटैः ।
स्पष्टं तैर्विधृताभिरेव लिपिभिस्स्वायम्भुवीभिर्यथा
कर्तव्यं जयरेखिकाविरचनं कल्प्येत कल्पावधि ॥८३॥

Note 21. Raghunāthābhyudayam, Sarga X.

तुण्डीरेभ्योदृष्टराजालयेभ्यः चाराः केचिद्दृष्टकार्यप्रचाराः ।
अभ्यागच्छन्नच्युतक्ष्मापसूनोः आस्तानीं तामक्षिसाफल्यधात्रीम् ॥

भटैःपुरातवसमरेपराजितः त्रपांविनाधररिधकैस्स्वसन्निभैः ।
विचारयन्त्यधिपमणे विंराधितां सकृष्णभूपतिरतिसत्ववानिव ॥६६॥

अवनीपतिराशये विधेयं सकलं हस्तगतं विचार्यसम्यक् ।
अथपञ्चनदं शनैरयासीत्तटमार्गेण मरुद्वृधातटिन्याः ॥६७॥

अधिवसन्नथतत्र सभान्तरे समुपगम्य समाचरितानतीन् ।
उपगतोत्तरदिग्विजयोत्सवान् प्रभुरलोकतयूथपतीन्निजान् ॥७४॥

अधिपतिरविदन्नथागतानि विमतधराधरवीररक्षितानि ।
भुवनगिरिमुखानियूपदुर्गाण्यहृतस्स सत्वरमस्सदीययोधैः ॥७५॥

अथ कृष्णजनाधिपस्समेतो यतिराजप्रमुखैरतीव यत्नात् ।
समराय समागतोऽस्मदीयैः भटवर्यैर्विदितः पलायितोऽभूत् ॥७६॥

Note 22. Raghunāthābhyudayam, Colophon.

चित्तानुवृत्त्या चिरमच्युतेन्दुः अमन्दमानन्दभरं बभार ।
तदीयधर्मान्परिपालयंस्त्वं चोळावनीं पालयसि प्रकर्षात् ।
श्रीरामसेतावपि कुम्भघोणे श्रीरङ्गधामन्यपि रामभद्रम् ॥

देवं प्रतिष्ठाप्य तदोन्नतानि प्राकारसद्गोपुरमण्टपानि ।
+ ÷ चम्पेशितुः पञ्चनदेश्वरस्य ॥

श्रीधेनुनाथस्य महेश्वरस्य श्रीश्रीनिवासस्थलसीम्नि विष्णोः ।
श्रीरङ्गनाथस्य वरप्रदातुः महत्तरं मण्डपमादधास्त्वम् ॥

श्रीकुम्भघोणेश्वरगोपुराग्र्यं हेमाद्रिकल्पप्रतिपादितानि ।
मुहुस्तुलापूरुषपूर्वकानि दत्तैस्त्वयार्थैः परितुष्टचित्ता ॥

चोलेषु काश्यामखिले च देशे भवजयस्तम्भनि (?) द्विजेन्द्राः ।
कृताग्निहोत्राः कृतिनो जयंति नित्यान्नदानं कुरुषे द्विजानाम् ॥

Note 23. Sāhitya Sudhā.

इति श्रीरामभद्रकरुणाकटाक्षलब्धसारसारस्वतप्रवर्धमान शतलेखिनी-
समयलेखिनीयाष्भाषाकल्पितचतुर्बिधकवितानुप्राणितसाहित्य-
साम्राज्यपदपीठारूढरामभद्राम्बाविरचिते रघुनाथा-
भ्युदये महाकाव्ये द्वादशस्सर्गस्समाप्तः ॥

The King of Vellore

England, 10-2-32.

[*My dear Sir,*

You may perhaps care to print this note, or else discuss it in correspondence. I should like to see the matter cleared up—especially as I am now editing another book in which the style 'King of Vellore' is applied to Venkata about 1612-14.

The main point is: Why dīd the inhabitants of Tegnapatam call their king 'King of Vellore' in March, 1610, and earlier? One could understand the survival of a style which had become obsolete: but, according to the Reviewer, this is the anticipation of a style which had not yet become appropriate.

Yours sincerely,
W. H. MORELAND.]

A friendly Reviewer in this *Journal* (August, 1931, p. 222) questioned the statement made in the Hakluyt Society's recent volume, *Relations of Golkoṇḍa*, that Vellore was the capital of Venkaṭa, the reigning sovereign of the Vijayanagar dynasty, from about A.D. 1608, the date to which the *Relations* go back; and suggested that the term 'King of Vellore' may have come into use owing to negotiations having been carried on with the King when he happened to be in camp at Vellore. It may be worth while to bring together the evidence on this point contained in European records of the period.

Portuguese envoys seem to have visited the Court of Venkaṭa fairly often, for whenever the Dutch went there they found Portuguese representatives at work; but no contemporary Portuguese records have been traced. No English envoys visited this King, so the evidence is confined to Dutch sources. The titles of these sources are cumbrous, and I shall cite them in abbreviated form, giving a fuller description at the end of the note.

Dutch relations with Vijayanagar began in 1608, when the Company was allowed to establish a factory at Tegnapatam, but on this occasion all the negotiations were conducted with the Nāyak of Gingee, or rather with his agent, known in the Dutch records as the great Ayā', (*Heeres*, 55, *De Jonge*, III, 280, *Terpstra*, Ch. IV), and there is no reference in the records to the King. Two years later, Arend Maertssen arrived on the Coromandel Coast with orders from the Directors of the Dutch East India Company to renew the arrangement for this factory, and an agreement was made with the Nāyak on 29th March, 1610 (*Heeres*, 78, *De Jonge*, III, 345). On this occasion Maertssen visited Gingee, and the new agreement was sent for sanction to the King at Vellore (*Terpstra*, Ch. V, where the story is told at length from the records in the Rijksarchief). About the same time correspondence was opened with the King regarding the establishment of a factory at Pulicat, and the King sent envoys to draw up an agreement for this factory; the agreement was sent to Vellore for sanction, and on the 28th April, authority was received to start trade. On 15th May, when Maertssen had gone to Pulicat for that purpose, the two agreements arrived there sanctioned by the King, with an invitation to Maertssen to visit the Court in person.

Maertssen with a small party started forthwith for Vellore, and on 25th May he found the King at a village about 25 miles short of that town. He hoped to settle matters there, but this could not be done because the King "desired that they should see his magnificence and royal state, his noble castles and remarkable buildings". The King therefore returned to Vellore, where Maertssen arrived on 27th May, and three days later he was received in audience. At this point a Portuguese envoy intervened, and for some time the King hesitated between the parties, but eventually he refused the tempting Protuguese offers, and the grant for the Dutch factory at Pulicat was not disturbed.

Maertssen then left the locality, having placed Hans Marcelis in charge of the new factory, where disputes with the local officials arose almost immediately. On hearing this, the King sent for both parties to Vellore. Marcelis started on 1st August, and, after some delay, had an audience of the King on the 30th. Portuguese envoys again intervened with presents and promises, and an interval of intrigue followed, but Marcelis was able to leave Vellore on 26th September, with the grant for Pulicat confirmed in a somewhat more favourable form. From these particulars it will be seen that in 1610 the King was in Vellore continuously, or almost continuously, from March to the end of September.

The next Dutch appearance at his court was in 1612, when Wemmer van Berchem, who had become Director of the Coromandel factories, came to Vellore to complain of the sack of the Pulicat factory by the Portuguese (Dijk, 24-28;

Heeres, 100-104, where Dijk's misreading of the name of Velover is corrected). Wemmer was a man of exceptional energy, and apparently possessed the art of getting things done quickly. He left Pulicat on 2nd December, had an audienee of the King at Vellore on 10th, obtained a formal agreement on 12th went on to Kolar, where Jaggarāja was with the royal army, made an agreement with him, and was back in Pulicat by 9th January, 1613.

No other Dutch mission to the court is recorded during Venkaṭa's lifetime; and, if these facts stood alone, they would not be inconsistent with the Reviewer's suggestion that the style 'King of Vellore' might have arisen from the accident of the King being temporarily at Vellore from March to September, 1610, and again in December, 1612, though the reference to the castles and buildings at Vellore is more appropriate to a capital city than to a temporary halting place. The suggestion is, however, definitely negatived by the fact that the style 'King of Vellore' was in use in Tegnapatam before any Dutchman had visited the King; it was used in the Dutch letter-book at least as early as 26th March, 1610, or two months before Maertssen's mission. Under that date the letter-book shows a letter "received from the great King *Venekat Poti Raij*, King of Velor", in which the King offered the Dutch a choice of one of the three ports "Pallicatte, Connomor, Armogon", and assured them of his protection. This letter has not, so far as I know, been published; the question is made from a photostat supplied by the Rijksarchief. The style 'King of Vellore' was thus current at Tegnapatam' one of Venkaṭa's seaports, in March, 1610, for of course the Dutch took it from the inhabitants of that place, at the time their only

factory in the Kingdom. If Vellore was not the captial at that time, I must leave the Reviewer to explain how the style in question came to be in current use, for I can think of no other possible origin.

The Reviewer writes that "In the days of Venkata certainly, the capital was still Penugonda, where he had to stand a siege by the Golkonda army in 1612, and where he actually died in 1614, if the local accounts could be believed." I do not know where to find the description of that siege, but is it certain that Venkaṭa was with the army? As has been said above, he was at Vellore in December of that year, when his army was at Kolar, so he was not always with the army at this period of his reign. As to the place of his death, in some parts of India it was the practice for a dying King to be taken to some particular place, commonly a former capital; might not this practice explain the local accounts which the Reviewer quotes with caution?

References.

De Jonge.—De Opkomst van het Nederlandsche Gezag in Oast-Indie, edited by J. K. J. De Jonge, The Hague, 1862–88.

Dijk.—Zes Jaren uit het Leven van Wemmer van Berchem, by L.C.D. van Dijk, Amsterdam, 1858.

Heeres.—Corpus Diplomaticum Neerlando-Indicum, compiled by J. E. Heeres, The Hague 1907.

Terpstra.—De Vestiging van de Nederlanders aan de Kust van Coromandel by H. Terpstra, Groningen, 1911.

The letter and the note printed above are from Mr. Moreland, and have reference to a review of a publication by the Hakluyt Society, Relations of Golkoṇḍa, on pages 219 to 223 of Volume X of the Journal of Indian History. The matter has reference to the Vijayanagar ruler of the period, Venkaṭa II, as he is sometimes called of Vijayanagar. His capital is referred to as Vēlūr, and, what is really more to the point, that he is himself described king of Vēlūr by European writers of the period, among them the Dutch correspondence published, in the Relations of Golkoṇḍa. The points at issue therefore are whether (1) there is justification for calling Vēlūr the capital of the empire of Vijayanagar under Venkaṭa; and (2) whether there is justification for his territory as a whole being described as kingdom of Vēlūr. Mr. Moreland's note gives full references to the Dutch correspondence, where Venkaṭapati is spoken of as king of Vēlūr with a variation in the spelling of the word. It would conduce to clearness if a short historical survey be taken of the rule of Venkaṭa II.

Venkaṭa was on the throne from 1585 to 1614. His coronation actually took place in Chandragiri, where he usually resided during the last years of the reign of his father and during the reign of his elder brother as viceroy of the south. When he was anointed, however, he was anointed as ruler of the empire of Vijayanagar, enthroned at Penugoṇḍa. His early inscriptions of dates 1585,* 1587,† and 1589‡ state that he was seated on the throne of the

* Epi. Col. 71 of 1915.
† Epi. Car. VII, S. H. 83.
‡ Ibid XII, C. K. 39.

Empire in Suragiri (or Penugoṇḍa). Other inscriptions at different dates also refer to him as being seated on the "Jewelled Throne" at Penugoṇḍa. These refer to year 1593,* 1599,† 1603,‡ 1605,§ 1608,¶ 1609,‖ 1610,** and 1612.†† We need go no further in search for authorities of this class, and may state it broadly that the proper style of the sovereign was " Ruler of Vijayanagar ", whether he be called king or emperor ; and he is generally said to be ruling from his throne at Penugoṇḍa, although we come occasionally upon records that refer to him as ruling from Vijayanagar itself. So far therefore as these inscriptional records go, we are concerned with the ruler of Vijayanagar, and his permanent capital is Penugoṇḍa.

We mentioned already that Venkaṭapati was accustomed to reside in Chandragiri as viceroy of the south, both under his brother and even under his father. During the period when the Jesuits of South India came into contact with him, he was in residence in Chandragiri, and Jesuit references regard Chandragiri as the capital. The Jesuit fathers who were sent out to reside at the court of Venkaṭa are spoken of as the Mission to Vijayanagar, though residing in Chandragiri. The annual letter of the Jesuits for

---

* 377 of 1904.

† Sewell's Lists of Antiquities, I, p. 134.

‡ No. 236 of 1903.

§ Sewell's Lists, I, p. 101 : 255 of 1903.

¶ Rangachari, I, pp. 535, and 622.

‖ 67 of 1915.

** 184 of 1913.

†† Epi. Car. II, TN. 62. Ibid XII, S ; 84. Butterworth and V. Chetty III, pp. 1284–86.

Eastern India speaks of El. Rey de Bisnaga.* The mission is spoken of as the mission to Vijayanagar in a letter of the previous year.† A letter‡ of Father Pimenta dated 1602 speaks of Venkaṭapati as the emperor of Vijayanagar in the capital at Chandragiri. Philip III's letter to the Portuguese viceroy refers to the ambassador from the king of Vijayanagar.§ The Dutch agreement regarding Pulicat refers to Venkaṭa as king of the Carnatic.¶ The traveller Floris refers to the king as "king of Narasinga".‖ The same writer refers to the same king as "king of Narasinga of Vēlūr" in a letter dated 1614.** There is a reference to the year 1606†† and the mission to Bisnaga visiting both Chandragiri and Vēlūr. In 1607‡‡ there is a reference to the mission to Bisnaga in Chandragiri. Similarly a letter§§ from the Provincial of Cochin refers to the king of Bisnaga. The annual letter dated 1607¶¶ refers to the kingdom of Vijayanagar several times. A letter from Philip III of Spain to Venkaṭa styles him king of Vijayanagar. The letter is quoted *in extenso* on page 445 of the Āraviḍu Dynasty. The letter in original is found in Appendix B of

---

* Appendix C, VI, Āraviḍu Dynasty of Vijayanagar by the Rev. H. Heras, S.J., M.A.

† Ibid letter C. II.

‡ Ibid C. V.

§ Āraviḍu Dynasty B. 7.

¶ Ibid, pp. 433–54.

‖ Purchas, His Pilgrims III, p. 320.

** Ibid III, pp. 326–37.

†† Father Quitinno's letter to Father Aquiviva, Ibid C. 13.

‡‡ Ibid C. 18.

§§ Ibid C. 21.

¶¶ Ibid C. 22.

the work. There is again a reference* to the mission to Bisnaga in a letter of date 1608, but referring to the year 1606–7. In 1611† the letter from Cochin quoting one of the previous year, December 12, refers to Rey de Bisnaga. The memorial‡ against Jesuits some time before 1610 also makes similar references. In a letter of 1613,§ Mylapore is referred to as belonging to the king of Bisnaga. This time it is the Portuguese viceroy that is writing to the king. A letter dated 1614 from the Portuguese viceroy to Philip III refers to the death of Rey de Bisnaga, and the disturbances that followed. The same year a letter from Floris speaks of 'the king of Narasinga of Vēlūr.¶ There is a similar reference to him as 'king of Vēlūr' in a letter‖ of John Gourney dated 18th July 1614. Floris refers to his death as that of the king of Vēlūr. It will be seen from this that while the general style and description of this ruler is as the King or Emperor of Vijayanagar, he is sometimes spoken of also as king of Narasinga. References to him as king of Vēlūr are not altogether absent, even among writers other than the Dutch.

Venkaṭa was during the first few years after his coronation, about seven or eight years, in Penugoṇḍa, which then came to be spoken of as the royal capital. About 1592–93, he moved into Chandragiri, where he had been accustomed to stay for long years, as that was his viceregal

* Ibid C. 26.

† Ibid C. 31.

‡ Ibid C. 37.

§ Āravīḍu Dynasty of Vijayanagar, B. No. 17.

¶ Purchas, His Pilgrims III, pp. 336–7.

‖ Letters received from East India Company 2, p. 83.

headquarters. There apparently he stayed usually. The representatives of the Jesuit missions met him there, and some of them went into residence there as representatives of the mission at his court. It was in 1604 or a little later that Lingama Nāyaka son of Chinna Bomma of Vēlūr rebelled. The rebellion was put down after defeating Lingama at Minnali, as it is called, a small railway station on the Madras—Bangalore railway line, and a subsequent siege of the strong fort of Vēlūr. After the place had been taken and order was introduced Venkaṭa, went into Vellore where he was in residence for a number of years. He often moved out of the capital and stayed elsewhere. On one occasion a mission of the Jesuits went to him when he was 45 miles away in camp. The mission was asked to meet him at Vēlūr to which he returned later. The Jesuit representatives continued to be in Chandragiri. The king himself was sometimes there, so that it would seem as though it did not matter where the king was in residence. The kingdom continued to be the kingdom of Vijayanagar, or the kingdom of the Karnāṭaka, and he was still ruling from the royal capital of Penugoṇḍa, seated on his diamond throne, in formal documents.

References to the king of Vēlūr therefore would be correct only if one understood the king *of* Vēlūr to mean the king *at* Vēlūr. The fact that he is referred to sometimes in that style by occasional travellers will not justify his being called "the King of Vēlūr". Vēlūr constituted certainly a government, but as a government it was subordinate to the Nāyak at Gingee, so that Vellore did not enjoy the privilege of even being a Nāyakdom of the standing of Madura,

Tanjore or Gingee. Of course, it is not impossible by virtue of its position and its importance as a fortified centre, that it may have served as the capital. When inscriptions of Venkaṭa and his subjects always call him king of Vijayanagar, when even foreign travellers and the Jesuit fathers style him generally as king of Vijayanagar or king of Narasinga (this latter being a peculiar European designation more or less exclusively), and when, in formal documents by the Portuguese viceroy and even of the Spanish King Philip III, he is styled king of Vijayanagar or emperor of Vijayanagar, the justification for calling him king of Vēlūr seems small indeed. People may certainly speak of him as king of Vēlūr in the sense that the king was then in residence in Vellore, as in fact he was the king of that part of the country. It is hardly necessary to pile up more evidence.

While at the subject, we may perhaps refer to another incident to which the review made reference, the siege of Penugoṇḍa by the Muhammadans in 1612. This comes out in detail in the *Raghunāthābhyudayam*, the life of the Tanjore Nāyak Raghunātha. The author of the Āravīḍu dynasty, my friend the Rev. H. Heras, refers to Raghunātha's assistance to Venkaṭapati to the period of the siege, of Penugoṇḍa very early in Venkaṭa's reign. This is hardly possible for the following reasons. Raghunātha at the time is spoken of as a young man, hardly fit to bear the responsibilities of rule, and his father Achyuta required to be persuaded to entrust him with the administration and abdicate, about 1614 or thereabouts as he had grown very old and rather other-worldly minded to continue in power.

As a result of the services rendered to the country and the emperor, Raghunātha is said to have obtained the release of Krishṇappa Nāyaka of Gingee who was in prison in Penugoṇḍa. Krishṇa was punished for his rebellion, and thrown into prison about the end of the year 1609 ; and it is later that he should have been pardoned and restored to his position. The siege that is referred to is a later siege, and not the earlier one, and Raghunātha's intervention must have taken place then.

Readers have now enough material to form their own opinion whether Venkaṭa or his immediate successors can be called kings of Vellore, while Vellore may be called a capital, or even the capital, during the period when the king happened to be resident there. Indian rulers certainly were accustomed to remain in various places in their territory even for considerable periods, the capital still remaining one fixed place, as the formal capital. It seems hardly necessary in this instance to regard it as any otherwise than this. Even grants* of Rāma II, the successor of Venkaṭa dated A.D. 1623 refer to his being in residence in Penugoṇḍa. Later on than this in A.D. 1636, the Kondiyāta grant† of Venkaṭa III refers to him as being in Penugoṇḍa while making the grant.

[*Reprinted from the Journal of Indian History Vol. XI, Part I*].

* Ep. Car. III, No. 62, Ibid 12 Ck. I.

† V. R. Vol. I, N. Arcot 325, A Copper-plate grant.

Ramaraya of Vijayanagar

It is a well known fact that the Empire of Vijayanagar did suffer vital injury at the so-called battle of Talikota, much more fittingly Rākshasatangaḍi, in 1565. The Empire held out intact, though, from another capital farther to the south and much better placed for defence against the enemies, in Penugoṇḍa. The last great ruler who can even be credited with having succeeded to a great extent in bringing the Empire back to its original greatness was the great Venkaṭapatirāya, Venkaṭa I of Vijayanagar, who ruled from 1586 to 1614. As he was usually in residence at Chandragiri for most of the period of his reign, he is sometimes spoken of as the Rāja of Chandragiri. The Empire, had been marked off into three divisions for convenience of administration and placed under the rule of the three brothers, Śriranga remaining at headquarters in Penugoṇḍa, Rāma taking charge of his viceroyalty with headquarters at Srirangapatam, and Venkaṭa remaining in Chandragiri and taking charge of the rest of the Empire. By the subsequent deaths of the two elder brothers, Venkaṭa became the sole ruler, and managed to rule the Empire with energy and bring into allegiance even those of the governors who showed a tendency to throw off the yoke of the Empire. The last of these powerful feudatories was Lingama Nāyaka of Vellore, and it was a war against him which brought him down, during five or six years at the beginning of the 17th century, into residence in Vellore,

thus making some of the European travellers speak of him sometimes as the King of Vellore. As his reign was drawing to a close, he could already see the signs of the coming war of succession which destroyed the Empire and left it altogether injured beyond possibility of recovery.

We take some extracts* from the correspondence of the officials of the East India Company on the Coromandel coast which throw some considerable light upon this feature, and we shall try to expound them in this note. Venkaṭa had two of his young nephews, the sons of his brother Rāma, the viceroy at Srirangapatam at his court. When viceroy Rāma, the elder brother died, Venkaṭa sent the elder of his two sons, to succeed his father and kept the younger, called Ranga or Śriranga, with him. Not only this. He seems early to have designed him as almost the heir-apparent to the Empire, even giving him the title *Chikkarāya*, which, as it was understood at the time, meant the heir-presumptive, One of his queens, however, who remained childless, and was believed to be so even by Venkaṭa himself, apparently cherished other ambitions and had a baby, which she claimed to be her own child, brought up in the palace without Venkaṭa doing anything to prevent it, with the result that she got confirmed in the belief that she had the countenance of the Emperor in regard to the presumptive claim of this putative boy. On this death-bed, however, Venkaṭa, notwithstanding the protests of prince Ranga his nephew, installed him as the Emperor, and thus brought about a

* These extracts are taken from *The English Factories in India* edited by Sir William Foster.

conflagration which well-nigh destroyed the Empire completely.

The queen who claimed to have a child belonged to the powerful family of Gobbūri chiefs and her brother called Jaggarāya was, in consequence, perhaps the most powerful nobleman of the Empire, and possessed of the highest resources in the state next only to the Emperor. He probably found it would be more advantageous to himself, and would meet the needs of his ambition better, if the boy-nephew were placed on the throne instead of Ranga who had received already some training as prince, and may be expected to take his own line in the government of the Empire. Immediately after the installation of Ranga, Jaggarāya started a movement, trying to enlist the nobles of the Empire on his side. This was made easy for him by certain acts of the new King. It is not our purpose here to discuss the history of this movement on this occasion.*

This gradually developed to the extent of a great many of the feudatories of rank in the Empire joining Jagga, and left the Emperor almost without any loyal chieftains among those of rank, with the exception of one doughty champion of the Emperor's cause in the Velugoṭi chief named Yāchama Nāyaka, the founder of the family of Venkaṭagiri.

In a short time it became clear that everybody worth the name joined the opposition, and the King was left almost alone. Taking advantage of his rela-

* For details refer to *The Journal of Indian History, Vol. V.* (1926) pp. 164–88.

tionship to the royal family and the dominent influence that he wielded at court, Jaggarāya was able gradually to surround the King with his men, making him powerless, and actually imprisoning him in one of his palaces under his own guard, proclaiming his own nephew Emperor instead. This was opposed by Yāchama Nāyaka single-handed, and he gradually developed his resources by gaining a few allies, and thus began the great war of succession in Vijayanagar. It took two years before this struggle could come to a final decision. It is a massacre of the royal family that precipitated the war, Jaggarāya having ordered the wholesale murder in cold blood of Ranga and all his family. Before the day appointed for the purpose, Yāchama Nāyaka managed cleverly to secure possession of one of the sons of Ranga, his second son by name Rāma, who was about ten or twelve, the elder brother being a grown up young man for the purpose, as the arrangement was for a washerman to smuggle the boy out of the fort. After a number of skirmishes, the war was ultimately decided by the battle of Toppūr, the village now being called Tōhūr, quite close to the Grand Anicut on the southern bank of the Kāvēri. Among the principal viceroys, the Nāyak of Tanjore was the only one who remained loyal, all the other Nāyaks having joined the side of Jaggarāya. The battle went against the allies, Jagga fell in battle, and this young prince Rāma was installed as Emperor by Raghunātha Nāyaka of Tanjore at Kumbhakonam, where there is a temple built to God Rāma in memorial thereof. This Rāma who was a tender boy at the time of this fateful accession to the throne, ruled over Vijayanagar down to the year 1630, the father having hardly ruled for more than a month. When

he was installed in due form as Emperor in 1616 or 1617, he could count upon the support of Raghunātha Nāyaka of Tanjore who officiated at his accession, and the loyal chieftain Yāchama Nāyaka with perhaps a few more chiefs of comparatively minor rank. All the other feudatories of the Empire were up in arms, or at least had compromised themselves by taking up arms against him, and it was a question of almost conquering the Empire over again before it could be brought into loyalty to him. He had to struggle all the years of his reign from 1616 to 1630, for which we have no direct sources of information. That his reign was disturbed throughout is borne out by the few extracts which we bring to notice here, and that is about all the information we so far seem to possess.

The period of rule of Emperor Rāma corresponded to the period of struggle of the English East India Company to get out of Masulipatam and found a place on the coast of Coromandel, where they could build a factory, fortify it for purposes of safety, and carry on their trade with the inhabitants of the interior unmolested, and without being subjected to the extortions that they complain of from the Nawab of Golkoṇḍa and his officers at Masulipatam. They had to change from one place on to another till at last they secured the site, on which they built Madras. They found themselves uncomfortable at Masulipatam, and found it even impossible to maintain themselves at Pettapolee, and were on the lookout for a better place to the south under the rule of Hindu kings. They first settled at Pulicat with the Dutch, and finding that not up to their liking, changed to Armagon, and ultimately secured the site of Madras.

The letters which the agents of the Company wrote home in the course of their search for a suitable locality, give us some information regarding the condition of the country. Writing from Pulicat, they refer to the state of affairs as under—

"Trust that these goods, which cost first penny 18,017 pagodas 10 (6/11 fanams, equivalent to 24,774 rials 6) will give satisfaction. Could not procure all the 'tappie grandes' and 'tappie chinds' desired, owing to the recent hostilities. The natives complain that they gain nothing by the woven cloths, especially the 'camgoulows, tappie grandes and tappie quechills', and probably this is correct. Think that the merchants deserve some inereased benefit, particularly as they have to be responsible for the money advanced through them to the weavers and painters, 'which oftentymes pays them with a farewell'. If the English had to deal direct with these persons, 'att the years end, when wee expected to be invested of our goods, wee should undoubtedlye come shorte of half our quantitye, besides undergoe a hazard of their runing away wher ther were no hope for us to fynd them out or recover our monies'. Moreover, as the water here is so bad and brackish that cloths washed in it 'have noe good lusture', the natives have to carry them to 'Slaves, att the least six Jentes (Gentoo) leagues, and being in another government are forced to pay junkan uppon every cloth or painting'. This year, however, they were obliged to remain within the limits of Pulicat, for fear of the enemy. Some of the native merchants express astonishment at the English quitting Petapoli to come and live at Pulicat at much greater expense, affirming that cloth

made at the former place is far better and cheaper than that of the latter; 'the only difference in the sorts of each fardell not their performed (as ?) heer, neyther the borders and richcos so neatly and clearly wrought,' though perhaps the provision of patterns might induce them to remedy this".*

The document quoted above has reference to the years 1622-23, and is actually dated July 26th, 1622, which explains first of all the difficulty that the Company's agents experienced in the purchase of cloth. This had to be purchased from manufacturers, actually individual weavers who had to be advanced money and the cloth taken when finished. They had to operate therefore through Indian agents who knew the people and could be sure of advancing money and collecting the money or the cloth. Pettapolee was well situated for the purpose, and had certain obvious advantages in regard to the quality of the cloth and the facility for purchasing, but had to be abandoned because of the extortions, as they complained, of the Muhammadan officers of Golkoṇḍa. They found that their settlement at Pulicat under the hospitality of the Dutch proved to be a matter of great disadvantage, and that is what they complain of in the extract given above.

The second extract complains of the difficulties that the Company's officials experienced at the hands of the Dutch, who secured the privilege of building a fort from the old Emperor Venkaṭa in 1606, and had fortified the place for themselves. They had to accommodate the English factors in the locality as best as they could. Naturally the

---

* *The English Factories in India*, 1622-23, pp. 104-5.

accommodation was unsatisfactory, and, as they were both engaged in the same kind of a trade, their interests clashed. Apart from that there were other difficulties in the locality. That is what is referred to in this extract.

"After paying their debts and reserving a sum for Fort charges, they have invested the rest of the money sent. Hope that Batavia will soon receive a further supply. The Dutch refuse to allow them a voice in the engagement or disposal of the garrison; they have added to the common charges, and evidently 'their proceeding is more to weary us then otherwise, which on our partts wee wish might shortly come to pass'. The end of the Dutches government is approaching. haveing but 10 mont(h)s to come;* and the said government bestowed on greatt Nayco (Nayak) of the countrey, who is to send (serve?) the sayd Itteraj (Itiraja), lord of this place, uppon all his occasions, who remaine as fearfull of the succeeding tymes: which Nai(c)o is to furnish likewise 4,000 men att all commands. What alterations their may be by this change wee are to attende, butt may feare wilbe worse for our negocyations. Ther is doubted ther wilbe such polling and taxing of the poore, I meane weavers and painters that have imployment in our afaires, that will peradventure cause them forsake the

---

* Mr. Heeres (*Corpus Diplomaticum Neerlando-Indicum*, p. 159) prints the grant by '*Itteragie*' to the Dutch, dated August 28, 1620 (N. S.). In this the former is stated to be governor over forty 'Jentjsche' miles of land. From L.C.D. Van Dijk's *Zes Jaren uit het Leven van Wemmer Van Berchem*, p. 30, we learn that 'Itteragie' was brother to 'Jaggeragie' (Jaggaraja), the principal noble of King Venkaṭa I.

place, which is common in theise sorte of people to exacte".*

The contract that the Dutch obtained was drawing to a close, and is stated that the concession was made to them by one Itteragie (Yatirāja). This Yatirāja as viceroy entrusted this part to the government of a Nāyak, who had to supply 4,000 men to Yatirāja's army, and the extract dated July 26th, 1622 complains that this new governor was likely to be exacting, and would make the position of the weavers difficult ; and therefore the Company's agents were likely to be put to difficulties to get the cloth that they required, or even to recover the advances made for the purpose, as any oppression or bad government generally turns out these people from the locality, those that had advanced money, of course, would stand to lose. This Yatirāja, referred to in the correspondence here is no other than Gobbūri Yatirāja, the brother of the traitor Jaggarāya, the arch enemy of the ruler Rāma. Problably he took possession of the extensive government of his brother when the latter fell in battle at Toppūr, and was in all probability the most powerful governor in the Empire, only disaffected to the present ruler. Naturally therefore the Emperor or those who managed the business for him had to beat him into submission, and that is what we find referred to in the next two extracts dated 20th and 21st October 1622.

"Our old friend Chemenique (see p. 139), as we understand hath adjoyned his forces and is sett forward with two or three thousand men towards theese partes ; the

---

* *The English Factories in India*, 1622-23, pp. 106-7.

brute of whose cominge hath strocken such a feare in theese countrey people hereaboute that makes them flie to Pallicatt with bag and baggage, and within theise seven dayes here are retired above two thousand people. What will ensue hereupon we are yet ignorant, but must leave it to the triall of time. Here hath fallen within this eight days great store of raine; insomuch that wee remaine incirculed with water, which is a suffitient defence against the enimie and hath brought no small content to the inhabitants of Pallicatt." ' *

" Much rain has fallen and more is anticipated, 'by the demonstrance of the heathenes'. 'The cowardlie enimie is com on forward with a small force, but durst not visitt in Pallicatt, he beginninge his pranckes as he did the last yeare, and yesterday sett upon an emptie village within three miles of Pallicatt and sett it on fire, the inhabitants beinge two dayes before fled hether. They have but a cold time of itt, all the countrey beinge all over with water; wherefore I suppose sett those poore houses on fire to warme themselves.'"†

The letters speak of Cheminique, which seems to stand for Ēchama Nāyaka, rather a corrupt form of Yāchama. This is an attack upon the district round Pulicat for dispossessing Yatirāja and taking possession of it. Yāchama Nāyaka apparently is the loyal chief who was practically instrumental in bringing about Rāma's succession, and must have been the officer whose loyalty and interest alike demanded the dispossessing the disaffected officers, among

* *Ibid*, p. 133.

† *Ibid*, p. 134.

whom the chief must have been Yatirāja, the younger brother of Jaggarāya. These extracts refer to the years 1622–23. The next long extract gives more detail about this war between Yāchama Nāyaka on one side and Yatirāja on the other.

Little news, except of 'the approach of our last yeres enymye, who the 20th of October entered a small village neare borderinge, and within sight of Pallecatt sett the same one fire, and burnynge all to the ground their raysed a forte of mud and other combustable (*sic*) mixed together, which finished in two dayes and two nights, bringing with them coules (coolies) for the purpose. But Iteraja, who is lord of theise partes, having notice thereof, presently assembled his forces, beinge to the number of four or five thousand persons, and the 28th ditto beseiged the said forte, the enymye beinge within noe more then 300 persons, which notwithstandinge held out a day or two, tlll the Dutch were faine to send hym, the said Iteraja, two, peeces of ordnance out of the forte, with two or three gunners to his assistance; which the enymye perceivinge, fearinge the worse, demaunded caule and they would deliver up the forte and retire themselves; which was performed, and the ordnance brought againe into the forte the 30th ditto; whereupon there was a great man interposed himselfe beetweene them both in the waye, as supposed by a frendly disposition, to make a league of frindshipe and accord; and standing both to his sensure, assigned eash (each) his quarter or portion of land which formerly they held, which was devided by a river which parted the same. And conditions being drawne and writtings past beetweene them, the said Iteraja, as void

of any further suspition, began to remove his forces, and came even att the towne of Pallicatte, mindinge to retorne to his whome, left the forte without any person therein, only one parte of theise tender walles have raysed to the ground in the meane tyme. And the day followinge the aforesaid enymie, as false as politicke, whose hed hath name Cemenique, in the nyght retorned with 2,000 persons and rasyed againe the said forte and made itt somethinge larger, and hath put therein 500 persons, and soe remaines himselfe neare in company with 10,000, this beinge within three myles of Pallicatte. This Iteraja on the contrary understandinge of this false afore pretended dishonest, dealinge, avowed by all their fidelities and pagodas to be truly kept one both sides, which now beinge so treacheouslye broken, the said Iteraja, with much rage and discontente, requiringe assistance of his brothers and other his frends, hath againe taken the feild and lies now within a mile ½ of his enymye with four thousand, and dayly attends a further supply. He is a man by all reported of a stoute corrage; his onlye want is money to supply his occasions att present, whereof the other is well tored and therefore is of more forse. They both strive for that they have noe right unto, but patronize as their owne until the Kinge be established, which is yett younge; besides he is held in small esteeme as yett. What will follow by theise chains of troubles, the conclusion will make appearance; but in the meane tyme we greatly feare, yea verily beeleeve, our negotiations wilbe greatly hindered, if not in our expectation wholy frustrated; for this Cemenique, whose dritte and ayme is for Pallecatt, to bringe itt in subjection under his government, that he might have the sacken of the inhabitants,

who is possest they enjoye an infinitt of means, and therefore would faine be plucking of their feathers; which having soe subjected, would lett them rest till they were growne out againe and fully ripe. This forte which he the enymye injoyes is just in the high waye from Pallicatte into the countrey, whereby you may perceive the danger that depends thereon. Pallicatte of itselfe affordeth noe manner of commoditye for our imployment, only most parts of the persons imployed therein; and for our best paintings they are most parte salure and mayer, by reason of the water att other place abrod in the countrey, a Jentesh (see p. 104) league from hence; whereby you may partly imagin what incorradgment theise people can have to sett themselves aworke in theise troublesome tymes, when on all sides their is burnynge and spoyllinge where they come'. The Dutch Governor on his arrival finding the English in a small cottage, gave them a better one to their content, being the house of the gunner, who had been sent to Batavia for some offence."*

There is a sentence in the middle of it which says that "both of them strive where they have no right to patronise as their own until the king be established who is yet young: besides he (king) is already in small esteem as yet". The English as well as the Dutch perhaps were certainly in doubt at the time what would happen to them and their interests if Yāchama Nāyaka succeeded in gaining Pulicat, which, according to them was clearly his object.

This has reference to the November of 1622, and that is above five to six years after the battle which placed

* *Ibid* pp. 138–40.

Rāmarāja upon the throne, and this state of things appears to have continued almost to the end of his reign, although we do not appear to have many references to these. But a letter dated August 20, 1629 has the following extract —

"The greate king of the Gentewes is nowe in his wares growne soe powerfull that hee hath conquered and regayned all his former dominions save only our Naige of this place, who (it ?) is supposed cannott long subsist : wherfore perforce must leave his countrey. What alternations these proceedings will bring unto our masters affayres in this place wee must refer unto tyme, and with that smale force wee have vigilently to stand upon our owne gards untill God send us more force ; yet wee have noe cause to doubte butt that hee wilbe comformable to reason, as this our Naige hath formerly bene. But in whatt manner the Dutch will proceede with the King upon these alterations wee knowe nott, butt have reason to doubt of them by reason of there former underhand dealing ".*

This extract gives us the indication that the king had at last got so much control over his Empire that the Company felt they would be in a position to negotiate with him through the Nāyak of the locality round Armagon. It was the establishing of a settlement there that they were considering about, and shows clearly that the authority of the Emperor was getting to be more or less firmly established. We have evidence of literature that Yatirāja was father-in-law of Rāma. This fact is referred to in a

* *The English Factories in India*, 1624–29 pp. 346–47.

foot-note to one of the extracts above on the authority of a Dutch writer. We know further from literature that Yatirāja's daughter was the second wife of Rāma, Rāma having had another wife. This would indicate it was a diplomatic marriage, and possibly entered into with a view to bringing Yatirāja over to the interests of Rāma. We could well believe that not merely war and subjugation, but other means as well were adopted for bringing the rebel feudatories to a feeling of loyalty to Rāma. This must have been a gradual process, and must have taken a long time. The extract above is dated just one year before the end of the reign of Rāmarāja. We may therefore say that poor Rāma, who could be no more than a young man of 24 or 25 at the time has had to struggle practically all his reign to get the Empire under his control, and hardly succeeded before his reign came to a close. It was this continuous war among the chieftains of the Empire that left it to an extent permanently damaged. We have references to the exclusion by these Nāyaks of the Dutch not only from Armagon, but even Kottapalli much farther north in the Nellore District is specifically referred to. Golkoṇḍa could not have advanced so far south as yet, and the boundary, as Sir William Foster suggests, was probably along the Guṇḍlakamma river. So we see that the decisive engagement in the war of succession and the defeat and death of Jaggarāya took place early in the year 1617, and young Rāma who then could not have been more than 14, succeeded to the throne actually in the latter part of that year. His reign came to an end in 1630, giving him length of rule of twelve to thirteen years, the greatest part of which, up to 1629, he was engaged in bringing his rebel vassels back

to loyalty to him. He could hardly have had a year after that when he died comparatively a youn man, and this conclusion is confirmed by the fact that he left no successor notwithstanding his two marriages, and the succession had to go to a collateral.

[*Reprinted from the Sardesai Commemoration Volume 1938.*]

Maduraitala-Varalaru.

(An account of the temple of Madura.)

This document professes to give an account of the temple of Madura, in all the vicissitudes of the political history of the place. This recording of history, it does only incidentally; its main purpose being to record not history but the various grants and donations made to the temple from time to time by various parties, state as well as private. The series of donations made to the temple from time to time, or a great many of them, were celebrated in verse composed for the occasion in a large number of cases, though not all. Such verses are found recorded in various parts of the temple, not only in Madura but also in other large temples of the same character. They suffer from the disadvantage that they are detached pieces, and give but little hint as to the actual position of the persons or bodies concerned. This prose account however attempts to give a connected narrative or chronicle history of the temple as a preliminary to a record of the donations made to the temple from time to time. As such it is of great value as a historical document, while the verse part of it could be made use of to check or confirm this account.

2. This document brings the history down to the assumption of the Government of Madura by the East India Company in 1801, and therefore must have been compiled

about that date. It is a narrative written in quaint popular Tamil, and falls far short of the demands of Tamil classical prose. This sometimes makes a literal translation difficult, but adds perhaps to its value as a historical document, as it gives evidence of composition by people whose object was not the production of literary documents, but a true record of the benefactions to the temple. It readily challenges comparison with another document of a similar character which the Rev. William Taylor translated from the local records collected by Mackenzie and entitled the "Pāṇḍyan Chronicle." On a superficial comparison, the two documents may be regarded as one, as in fact, it was stated to be; but there are characteristic differences of expression, notwithstanding the quaintness of language, which makes this a document distinct from the other. Both of these seem to be based upon the same anterior material which must have been records preserved in the temple. During the administration of the great Viceroy Tirumala Nāyaka a record like this seems to have been preserved in the temple, which he ordered should not be removed from the Treasury Chamber of the temple, even to be produced as evidence. Further he seems to have taken care that the record be brought to-date and extracts be given when demanded without removing the main document from out of the chamber in which it was to be carefully preserved, special provision being made even against possibilities of accidents by fire, etc. These two documents therefore seem to have been based on documents preserved in that fashion, and written up from time to time and brought up to-date. This character of the documents therefore gives them great value as historical documents.

3. Both of these documents pass over the first thirteen centuries and a quarter, without any specific details of history other than that from God Śiva himself and his son Ugra, have expired 465,650 years to the time of Kulaśēkhara, apparently the Kulaśēkhara, who succeeded to the throne in 1268 and ruled till 1311. It may however be a later Kulaśēkhara, who followed in the second generation after him. Anyhow, the account in the chronicle begins with a date equal to Śālivāhana Śaka 1256, which would be the equivalent of A.D. 1324 and with the invasion of Madura by a Muhammadan described under the name, *the first Sultan Malik Nemi*. He is said to have been the founder of a dynasty of Muhammadan rulers of Madura although the first ruler of the dynasty is described as Ulāpati-Khan the Tamil form of Ala-ud-din Khan. The chronicle, however, seems to confound between the first two rulers Jalal-ud-din, and Ala-ud-din, as it describes both of them by the latter name, and is also otherwise in error by a period of about 5 years as it anticipates the foundation of the sultanate by actually dating it with the Muhammadan invasion under Muhammad-bin-Tughlak. It is these documents among the country records which actually mention the Muhammadan sultanate of Madura, and give as many as 8 rulers of whom the first is a mere invader, and the remaining 7 were actually rulers of Madura. In the form in which this dynasty is described in these records, it was difficult to write a consecutive history of this dynasty in detail. From the study of the coins of the Sultans of Madura already made by Dr. Hultzsch, for about 20 years Epigraphist to the Government of Madras, the history of the dynasty referred to in the Tamil records could be restored. As a mere chronicle

summary, it does not offer much information about the dynasty, except for a mere succession ; but one thing it makes clear, the complete destruction of the Madura temple and palace of which we get a vague hint in the account of Ibn Batuta, who was for a couple of years in South India as the guest of the 4th ruler, whose wife's sister Ibn Batuta had married in Delhi. We have so far had, however, no clear account of the kind of destruction that Madura underwent under the Muhammadans, and these records make it clear for the first time. The destruction was so complete that it was only the sanctum of the god and the goddess that were left undestroyed, the gods themselves having been removed to Nānjināḍu in southern Travancore for safety.

4. Hindu rule was restored in Madura according to this document in A.D. 1371 by Kampaṇa Uḍaiyār, commander of the guards of the Mysore ruler, from the point of view of the writer of the record in its final form ; but at the time the Mysore ruler was Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III, the last great Hoysala ruler of whom we get a very good account in Ibn Batuta. Kampaṇa Uḍaiyār is otherwise known from inscriptions and other records as the son of Bukka, one of the two brothers to whom the credit of the foundation of the Vijayanagar empire is popularly given. The relation between the two brothers and the Hoysalas was hitherto unknown, at any rate not specially stated anywhere. This, for the first time, makes it clear that they were officers of the Hoysalas, for which there are a few hints in Ibn Batuta and the *Burhan-i-Māasir* both of which have been used by me to establish this position in "South India and her

Muhammadan Invaders". Kampaṇa Uḍaiyār was Viceroy of the Muḷbāgal Mahārājya, and had for his sphere of office all the south. Madura came into his possession, which he restored, as he did the great temple at Śrīrangam an account of which we get from other records. Kampaṇa's son Hemana and his nephew or son-in-law Porkāsu-Uḍaiyār between them ruled from A.D. 1371 to A.D. 1402. From 1403 to 1408 Lakkaṇa and Madana, two Brahman brothers, the first of whom was the great minister of Dēvarāya II, referred to as the great *Daṇṇāyak* by Abdur Razak, held it as their fief. Lakkaṇa had also the title and perhaps the charge of the 'lordship of the southern ocean.' Here we find an interesting detail, which had not hitherto been known, in this document. It is this Lakkaṇa Nāyaka who brought out of exile at Kāḷaiyārkōil the illegitimate son of the late Pāṇḍyas by name *Sundarattōḷ-Māvali-Vāṇādi-rāyan*, and installed him as the ruler of Madura. Three or four generations of these ruled in succession. Almost at the end of the century, in fact (A.D. 1497), Narasa Nāyaka, the general of the usurper Narasinga and father of the great ruler Krishṇadēvarāya, came on his southern invasion and Madura thereafter became his fief. Various other officers of the court held the position of Viceroy of the south almost to the end of the reign of Krishṇadēvarāya when the relations between the Viceroy appointed from headquarters and the local Pāṇḍya holding charge of Madura became intolerable. This seems ultimately to have led to the foundation of the Nāyakship as an independent family. Several persons seem to have held the office, among them Visvanātha himself for a short while, till at last in A.D. 1559 Visvanātha Nāyaka took charge of

it permanently, and thereafter Madura continued in that family, till 1739 when the last scion of this family was dispossessed and the territory actually passed into the possession of the Nawab of Arcot under Anwar-ud-din. His sons Mafus Khan and Muhammad Ali, were successively rulers of Madura, although it was Chanda Saheb's perfidy that actually drove the last queen to commit suicide, and led to the setting aside of her nominee. The remainder of this story is more or less well known from other sources, excepting of course the details regarding donations to the temple.

5. The narrative presents a sober account of the whole except that it relates the occurrence of a miracle in two places. The first is when Kampaṇa, after having overthrown the Muhammadan garrisons, occupied Madura. He is said to have come to the temple and ordered the sanctum to be opened when he was surprised to discover the lighted lamp burning and the garlands remaining fresh as though both of them were put in position the previous night. The second occasion when a miracle is resorted to is at a particular period of anarchy when Madura belonged to the government of Mafus Khan and Muhammad Ali. A Muhammadan fakir is said to have come and occupied the narrow space between the new colonnaded hall built by Tirumala Nāyaka and the main portal of the temple. He erected his little tent there and began putting up a brick wall to plant his flag on, which is a habit of the fakirs. There was no government in the country to prevent the illegal possession, and all the remonstrances of the people pr oved unavailing. The citizens had no alternative but to

shut themselves up in the temple when a statute of *Bhadra Kāḷi* in the north-eastern corner of the inner-hall began to open the eye-lids which remained open on the following two days. This occurrence became widely known, and people from various localities came to witness this miracle. A short time after, Madura passed into the possession of Yusuf Khan and when the matter was represented to him he chased the fakir out of the town, and gave possession of the temple back to its owners, restored its grants and introduced order. Barring these two instances there is no indulgence in relating the unbelievable. What happened to Madura in the interval between 1748 and 1751 was so far as our other sources are concerned not made clear. I believe this document, for the first time makes it clear that the garrisoning of the fort was made over to one Abdul Khumu Khan. This Abdul Khumu Khan seems to stand for Abdul Rahim Khan, who is referred to as a brother-in-law of Muhammad Ali in Ananda Ranga Pillai's Diary. There is an Abdul Rahim Khan, a brother of Muhammad Ali also. It was on this occasion that Alam Khan, a brother-in-law of Myana with 2,000 horse took forcible possession of Madura apparently in Chanda Saheb's behalf. This Alam Khan had to be turned out of the place before Madura could be taken possession of when Chanda Saheb had been defeated. In the meanwhile Myana who held Madura in the interests of Chanda Saheb sold it to the Mysoreans and returned to Tirumohūr. That was how the Mysore forces got possession of Madura from which they were turned out by the combined Hindu forces of the Setupati and the Zamindar of Sivaganga. Otherwise the narrative is verifiable from other known sources and gives

a reliable account, though brief, in chronological order of the transactions relating to the viceroyalty.

The chronicle itself is translated and annotated, and is under publication as appendix E to the "History of the Nāyaks of Madura" about to be published by the Madras University as "Madras University Historical Series No. II." A copy of the same is appended to this Note.

[*A Paper read at the Sixth Meeting of the Indian Historical Records Commission, held at Madras in January 1924.*]

APPENDIX E.

" MADURAITTALA-VARALARU. "

(*Account of the Sacred city of Madura.*)

After Śiva and his son Ugra, Kulaśēkhara obtained the throne on the expiry of forty lakhs, sixty-five thousand and six hundred and fifty years. Thus from the days of Kulaśēkhara Pāṇḍya to the days of Parākrama Pāṇḍya 'who sleeps with the wakeful sword'* the place enjoyed the Pāṇḍyan rule. During the Kaliyuga, Śālivāhana Śaka 1246, five hundred and one years after the destruction of Kollam in the month of Āni of the year Rudirōdgāri † the Ādisultan Malukkunemiyan came from Delhi, and having captured and sent Parākrama Pāṇḍya to Delhi took possession of the place. For a period of three years from Rudirōdgāri Āvaṇi to Krōdhana the region from the Himalayas to Sētu was under Muslim sway (*tulukkāṇiyam*), and after a state of hostility without anyone's gaining a clear ascendency, Ulāpatikhan came in the year Akshaya, and ruled for a period of six years till Prajōtpatti (A.D. 1326-31). The Ulāpatikhan ruled the place for a period of three years from Āngīrasa to the year Bhava (A.D. 1332-34). Then

---

* The expression is queer, and may be an erroneous transcript of a well-known title of Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya '*Vāḷāḷ-Vaḻitirandān*' . . . he who opened the way with the sword. *South India and her Muhammadan Invaders*, p. 53 Note i.

† This corresponds to the year A.D. 1323–24, the month Āni would make it the year A.D. 1323 June—July. This would correspond to K.A. 498 whereas the date given is 501 current.

his nephew Kudipatik ruled from the year Yuva to Pramādhīcha (A.D. 1335-39.)*

After this one Nagalatik ruled from the month of Āḍi in the year Vikrama to the year Vijaya (A.D. 1340-53). Then Savaudmalukkan and Āṭṭumarugan ruled from the year Sarvajit to the year Viḷambi (A.D. 1347-58). After this Pungatik Malukkan ruled the kingdom from the year

* The dates are in error being earlier than the actual years by about five years. The name of the second ruler Kudipatik leaves little doubt that the dynasty under reference is that founded by Sharif-Jalal-ud-din Ahsan-Shah. He ruled for five years A.D. 1335–40 and was followed for a year by Alaud-din Udauji. Then Quṭbu-ud-din for forty days in A.H. 740 (1339–40). The two Ulāpatikhans of the Tamil accounts seem to stand for the first two. The length of the reign of the three is wrong separately. The difference is made up with the third.

THE SULTANS OF MADURA.

I. Sharif Jalal-ud-din Ahsan Shah
coin. Jalal-ud-dunya Wa-d-din dated A.H. 738 also 739 and 40.

II. Ala-ud-din Udauji or Uduji
Alau-d-dunya Wa-d-din, Udauji Shah, date A.H. 740.

III. Quṭbu-d-din Firoz Shah, A.H. 740.
Qutbu-d-dunya Wa-d-din.

IV. Ghiyathu-d-din Muhammad Dama-ghan Shah, date A.H. 741.

V. Nasiru-d-din, Mahmud Ghazi Dama-ghan Shah, A.H. 745.
Break, 745–757.

VI. Adil Shah, A.H. 757.

VII. Fakhru-d-din Mubarak Shah. Muhammad Mustafa, legend
Nasifu-n-nabi, date A.H. 761–770.

VIII. Alau-d-din Sikandar Shah; A.H. 774–9.

J. R. A. S., 1909, pp. 667–83.

Vikāri to the year Sādhāraṇa (A.D. 1359-70). For a period of forty-eight years from Śaka 1246-93 the place had been under Mussalman sway; the god of the place went to the *Nānjilnāḍu* and the *Panjākṣaratirumadil* the enclosing wall named after the five letters, the five mystic letters composing the name of Śiva, namely *Ōm Namaśivāya*, and the fourteen *gōpuras* (gateways) as well as streets were pulled down. The sanctum of the Nāyagar (Lord) temple, the *ardhamaṇḍapam* (the inner hall) alone escaped destruction.

Thus when the land was under the Muslim domination in the year 1293 current Virōdhikṛt, A.D. 1371 Kampaṇa Uḍaiyār, commander of the guards of the Mysore ruler *, having defeated and driven off the Mussalmans, took possession of the kingdom and opened all the temples of Śiva and Vishṇu. When he opened the door of the sanctum of of *Tiruvālavāyuḍaiyanāyanār*, however, he noticed with surprise that the lamp lighted (before the temples were closed) and the garland (placed on the images) were exactly like those that they placed on the God only the previous night. As soon as Kampaṇa Uḍaiyār saw this miracle he slapped himself on the cheek as an expiation for the offence, and after much devotional worship to the God granted several *Tiruviḷayādal* villages (villages granted to the temple) several jewels, and grants for the daily offerings. Thus he and his son Empaṇa Uḍaiyār (*Hemmaṇṇa*) and his nephew (or son-in-law) Porkāśuḍaiyār ruled for a period of thirty-three years from the year Virōdhikṛt to the

* Mysore, as a state, was not then in existence, but the writer is apparently referring to his time. Kampaṇa's office must have reference to the Hoysala ruler of the time.

year Chitrabānu (A.D. 1371-1402). During their days they made many a provision for all the Śiva and Vishṇu temples for jewellery and daily offerings for the Gods.

Then from the year of Subhānu of Śaka 1327 current to the year Vibhava (A.D. 1403-48) Lakkaṇa Nāyakkar and Madana Nāyakkar ruled for a period of forty-seven years.

Then in the year Śukla, 1374 Śaka current Lakkaṇa Nāyakkar brought out of retirement the son of the concubine of the Pāṇḍyan king, Abhirāmi of Kāḷaiyārkōvil *Sundarattōḷ Mavalivānādirāyar*, *Kāḷiyār Somanār*, *Anjādaperumāḷ Muttaraśar*, and crowning him in the days of Tirumalaimāvali - Vānādirāyar as the son born of the Pāṇḍyan king with the deference due to the ancient royal family, gave him possession of the kingdom for forty-eight years.*

Then in the year Pingaḷa† (A.D. 1497); Vaikāśi of Śaka 1422 current, Narasayya Nāyakkar came, offered worship at Rāmēsvaram and also captured the fort. Tennanāyakkar ruled for fifteen years from the month of Āvaṇi of this year, Āngīrasa, (A.D. 1512). Then from Śrīmukha (A.D. 1515) of the year Śaka 1437 current to

* This passage is obscure in the original; the first name is that of the illegitimate son of the Pāṇḍya; the next name and the next which, I prefer to take as one name *Anjādaperumāḷ Muttaraśar*: these three in succession ruled for forty-eight years apparently. Lakkaṇa's coronation refers only to his installation of the first.

† There is a discrepancy in the date. The year Pingaḷa is A.D. 1497 and Śaka 1422 is A.D. 1500. The Cyclic year is likely, it seems to me, to be correct and the Śaka year wrong.

Dhātu (A.D. 1517) for a period of four years one Nāchiapiḷḷai ruled the kingdom. Afterwards Kurukūru Timmappa Nāyakkar ruled from Īśvara to Vishu for five years (A.D. 1517–21). Then from Śaka 1446 current from Chitrabhānu to Subhānu, for two years A.D. 1521–23 Kaṭṭiyam Kāmaiya Nāyaka ruled. From Tārana to Sarvajit (A.D. 1524–27) Chinnappa Nāyaka ruled for a period of four years. Īyakkarai Vaiyappa Nāyakkar ruled for a period of five years from the year Sarvadhāri to the year Nandana (1527–32). From the year Vijaya to the year Vibhava* (A.D. 1533–42) for a period of nine years Viśvanātha Nāyakarāyan ruled the kingdom. Varada ruled in the year Śubhakṛt (A.D. 1542–43). Tumbichchi Nāyakkar ruled from the year Śubhakṛt to the year Krōdhi (A.D. 1543–44), Kārtigai, for a period of a year. Viśvanātha Nāyakarāyan ruled from Krōdhi Mārgaḻi to the year Viśvāvasu (A.D. 1544–45) for a period of a year and seven months. One Viṭṭalarāja ruled from Prabhava to the year Pingaḷa (A.D. 1546–57). The three kings Timmappa Nāyakkar, Chellappa Nāyakkar and Paṭṭukōṭṭai-Vīrappa Nāyakkar ruled from Kāḷayukti to Raudri, Kārtigai (A.D. 1558–60). From Śaka 1246 to Śaka 1485 (A.D. 1324–63) twenty-seven persons ruled in Madura.

During the Śaka 1481 (A.D. 1559) current Raudri (A.D. 1560) Mārgaḻi, Viśvanātha Nāyakkar, son of Koṭṭiyam Nāgama Nāyakkar came under the orders of the Rāyar to Madura and died after a rule of twelve years extending from Raudri Mārgaḻi to Āngīrasa Vaikāśi (A.D. 1559–72). From the month of Āni of the above year to Vaikāśi of

* This ought to be Śōbhakṛt.

Vishu, (A.D. 1572–81) a period of nine years, Krishṇappa Nāyaka, son of Viśvanātha Nāyaka ruled and died. From Āni of the above year to the year Manmatha Vaikāśi (A.D. 1581-95) the son of Krishṇappa Nāyaka, Vīrappa Nāyaka ruled the kingdom for a period of fourteen years. For seven years from the above year to Śubhakṛt Āni (A.D. 1595–1613) Kumārakrishṇappa Nāyaka, son of Vīrappa Nāyaka, ruled and died. From Puraṭṭāśi of the year to Plavanga (A.D. 1602–67) Māśi for a period of five years Viśvanātha Nāyaka, the brother of Kumārakrishṇappa Nāyaka, ruled and died. His brother Kastūrirangappa Nāyaka died just eight days after he came to the throne in the prayer hall (*Sandhyāmaṇḍapam*) on the other side of the river. Muttukrishṇappa Nāyakkar, son of the above, ruled from Panguni of the above year till Dundubi Kārtigai (A.D. 1608–22) for a period of fifteen and three-fourth years and died. On the seventh of Mārgaḻi of the year Dundubhi Muttutirumala Nāyakkaraiyan, brother of Muttuvīrappa Nāyakkar, became very deserving of the grace of *Mīnākṣi-sundarēśvara* and made several gifts of jewellery, built 'the New *Maṇḍapa*' and a tank for the annual floating festival, constructed a gold-plated throne, an ivory worked car, a great stone seat and a throne set with rubies. He ordered several structures to be made to the seven great temples, gifted land with an income of 44,000 *pon* for the daily worship, and tax-free villages for the maintenance of servants and managers. He further made his individual daily gift of food and conducted the festivals on a grand scale. He constructed a new car for the Aḻagar for his Chaitra festival and made the temple celebrated. Whenever he personally came for purposes of worship he used to give

a votive offering of 1,000 *pon* as *pādakāṇikkai* for worship and offerings. If the god be taken in procession in *Māṣi-vīdi* he used to offer 1,000 *pon*. In this manner having ruled for a period of thirty-six years from the year Dundubi Māśi 7th to the year Viḷambi Māśi 4th, (A.D. 1623–59), he died on the night of the Tuesday of the year Viḷambi Māśi 4th. From the month of Panguni of the year Viḷambi (A.D. 1659) to Vaikāśi of Vikāri for a period of three months Muttuvīrappa Nāyaka ruled the place. For twenty-four years from Āni of Vikāri (A.D. 1659) Chokkanātha Nāyakkar, son of Muttuvīrappa Nāyakkar ruled. He died on the 4th of Āni.

His son Rangakrishṇamuttuvīrappa Nāyakkar then ruled from Rudhirōdgāri (A.D. 1683) 17th Arpiśi to the year Pramōdūta (A.D. 1690) for a period of seven years. Then his son Vijaya Rangamuttuchokkanātha Nāyakaraiyan being a child, his grandmother ruled the kingdom for some time, with him in her lap. At this period in the foundation of the Brahman settlements (*agrahāra pratiṣṭai*) and the founding and patronage of the choultries, divine and Brahman gifts, she conducted the administration as in the days of Tirumala Nāyaka. After the death of Mangammāḷ, Vijayarangamuttu Chokkanātha during his rule managed the affairs of the kingdom exactly as in the days of Tirumala Nāyaka. As things were going on in this manner, once, in the course of his ronnd of visits in the city *incognito*, he noticed that the temple worship, offerings, and services were not being properly conducted, and went back to the palace. The next day he sent for all the temple management and establishment (*sthalattār* and *parijanattār*)

and others, and enquired why the temple should have become so miserably poor in spite of his gifts of lands yielding 44,000 *pon*. He grew very angry as no satisfactory explanation was given and confiscated the lands under the control of the temple-management (*sthalattār*) to the government, sent for the mortgage deeds of the temple-management, and settled and gave out of the royal treasury 44,000 *pon* for the seven temples for purposes of daily worship (*pūja*), annual festival, monthly and other festivals, and also ordered the provision of a processional car for the Chaitra festival. He also made grants of tax-free villages as in the days of Tirumala Nāyaka for management, for worship, for offerings of food, and arranged for the proper management of the temple affairs.

After having ruled for forty years he died on the night of Śivarātri in the month of Māśi of the year Virōdhikṛt (A.D. 1731). From Virōdhikṛt Māśi to Siddhārti Vaikāśi (A.D. 1731–39) for the period of nine years Mīnākṣi Ammāḷ, the wife of Vijayarangachokkanātha Nāyakkar, crowned herself and ruled along with her brother Venkaṭaperumāḷ Nāyakkar.

On the night of Tuesday 30th of Vaikāśi Śaka 1668 (A.D. 1739) of Siddhārti, Vijayakumāramuttutirumalai Nāyakkar, son of Bangāru-Tirumala Nāyakkar, and Veḷḷaiyan-Śērvaikkāran of the Sētupati's guard moved out on news reaching that Chandēkhan-Baḍēkhan had captured Dindigul. Immediately after, the temple-management with all the attendants removed the gods Mīnākṣī-Sundarēśvara and Kūḍaḷ-Aḻagar (*Vishṇu*) to Vānaravīramadura (*Mānāmadurai*) and remained there for two years. The Sētupati provided for the

pūja and the daily offering of the god and also supplied the whole establishment with food and drink, and kept them under his protection for a period of two years from Āni of Siddhārti to Āni of Durmukhi. Meanwhile Dēśing-Rāja (Rāja Tej Singh) reached Trichinopoly fort with 60,000 horse, surrounded it, killed Baḍēkhan, removed all the Muslims and appointed Murārirao with instructions to restore the grants as usual, without any disturbance to the divine services, to all the Śiva and Vishṇu temples. He then retired towards the north. Afterwards Murāri Rāyar who was charitably disposed despatched Appāji Rāyar with 2,000 horse, and as he did not like to stay in a city without its God he started for Vānaravīramadura. Having worshipped the God there and obtaining the consent of the Sētupati he returned to Madura with the God an hour after nightfall on Saturday the 17th of Āni of Durmukhi year (A.D. 1741).

As usual in the Karnātaka days of Hindu rule he provided for the purificatory ceremonies of the temple (*śānti* and *samprōkṣaṇa*), and amply provided for the daily worship and services of the god in due form.

In the year of Rudhirōdgāri, Śaka 1664 current (A.D. 1743) the Mussalman Nizam (Nawab-Anvar-ud-din) came from the north, captured the forts of Trichinopoly and Madura, and went back to the north having placed them in charge of two persons Mafus Khan and Muhammad Ali Khan as Nawabs. They ruled the country for a period of ten years and six months, from Rudhirōdgāri to the 31st of Kārtigai of Āngīrasa (A.D. 1743–53) as a Muhammadan possession (*tulukkāṇiyam*). During this period in the days of Abdul Khumu Khan (Abdul Rahim Khan ?) of Madura fort,

Mayana's brother-in-law, Alam-Khan, came with 2,000 horse through the land of Toṇḍaimān, and took possession of the Madura fort. He ruled for a year as far as the frontiers of Tiruvaḍi (Travancore) and placed Mayana in charge of Madura when he proceeded to Trichinopoly to join the forces of Chandekhan (Chanda Sahib). Almukhan (Alam-khan) himself died in the disturbance that followed. Muhammadali (Muhammad Ali) put to flight Chande Khan's forces and beheaded Chande Khan himself.

Meanwhile Mayana, having sold possession of Madura fort to the Mysoreans so as to round off Mysore territory, retired to Tirumōhūr. After this Kuhu (or Kuku) Sahib of Mysore * entered the fort on the 30th of Puraṭṭāśi of the Āngīrasa year A.D. 1752. Hearing that the Mysoreans had taken possession of Madura, Veḷḷaiyan Śērvaikkāran, Commander of the Sētupati's guard and Tāṇḍavarāya Piḷḷai *pradhāni* of the Uḍayadēvar's (Zamindar of Sivaganga) guard, surrounded the Madura fort in great force. Having stood a siege from the 30th of Puraṭṭāśi to the 26th of Kārtigai of the year (A.D. 1752) Kuhu Sahib, as a result of arbitration, left the fort in charge of the Sētupati and retired in the direction of Dindigal.

As matters were in a state of confusion from the year Rudhirōdgāri to the year Āngirasa (A.D. 1743-52) in Kali 4853 Śālivāhana Śaka 1673 current, 16th of Kārttigai (A.D. 1651) of the Āngīrasa year, both Veḷḷaiyan Sērvaikāran, the commandant of the Sētupati's guard and Tāṇḍavarāya

* 'Kuhub Saheb, Jamedar of the Mysoreans' according to the Nawab Muhammadali of Trichinopoly. Country Correspondence No. 422 of 1754. See p. 31 N. I. S. C. Hill's *Yusuf-Khan*.

Pillai of Udayadēvar's guard entered the Madura fort, threw open the temples, conducted the services, and arranged for worship as usual; and as Kuhu Sahib had slaughtered several cows and done other unworthy acts during the siege they ordered the necessary purificatory ceremonies to be performed to the several temples. Being unwilling to see a state without its King, they sent for Vijaya Kumāramuttu-tirumala Nāyaka, son of Bangāru-Tirumalai Nāyakkaraiyan, from Vellikurichchi and crowned him king on Monday 14th of Mārgali of the year Āngīrasa in the sanctum of the goddess (*Nāchchiyār Sannadhi*), invested him with the sceptre, and took him to the palace.

Then, when he had ruled the kingdom for sixteen months, from the 14th of Māśi of Āngīrasa to the 30th of Vaikāśi of the year Śrīmukha, Mayana, Mahadimiya and Nabikhan,* these three sent the ruler out of the fort to Vellikurichchi, took possession of the Madura fort and the country around. As usual they confiscated the temple lands, destroyed the trade of the merchants of the city, the gardens, and the wells. While this was going on Kuhu Sahib of Mysore returned with Vellaiyan Śērvaikāran, surrounded the fort, and closely besieged the place for six months, with their headquarters camp under the banyan close to Panaiyūr. The forces of Mayana however, drove off Vēllaiyan Śērvaikāran and Kuhu Sahib, killing them in the affray, took possession of the fort of Madura, and maintained themselves in it from Āni of Śrīmukha to the 21st of Māśi of the year Bhava (A.D. 1753–55). Meanwhile in Kali 4855 Śaka 1675 current, Bhava 22nd of Māśi, Mafus Khan Sahib started with

---

* Mahamad Barkey (Mianah of Orme), Mahamad Mainach (Moodemiah), Nabikhan Cattack.

1,000 Europeans and twenty guns from Dēvanāmpaṭṭaṇam and coming through the pass of Nattam took possession of the Madura fort. As the Tirumōhūr temple in which Mayana stayed was used as a fort, the Europeans entered it and took possession of the jewellery of the god and the idols, and returned to Madura.

Then they advanced as far as Tinnevelly and returned to Madura. Finally returning to Trichinopoly they carried the idols of Tirumōhūr on the backs of camels. On their march to Aḻagarkōvil the native Kaḷḷars fell upon them, took possession of the idols, and restored them to the temple. Some time after, when Barakadulla otherwise Danishmund Khan (*vīde* page 40 of N. 2 S. C. Hill *Yusuf Khan*) was exercising power at Madura in behalf of Mafuskhan, a Muhammadan fakir came and erected his tent (*niśan*) in front of the *pudumaṇḍapa* of Tirumala Nāyaka; and as he was making preparations to build a double brick wall with a view to hoist a flag on the platform of the *gōpura* of the temple, the whole body of the temple officials, the local merchants, and other inhabitants, all met together and made every effort to make him desist. In spite of their protest he refused to get down from the *gōpura* as it was a time of anarchy without authority to compel obedience. The temple management then closed the four gates of the *gōpura*, and entering the temple, remained inside. In this state of affairs the eye of the image of *Vāḍāḍum Bhadrakāḷi Amman*, in the South-eastern corner of the golden pillar of the Assembly Hall (*āsthāna maṇḍapam*) opened on the 3rd of Tai, about an hour after daybreak and remained open till about day-break on the 5th of the same month. This occurrence of the

miracle soon circulated in all directions, and people flocked to the place as on festival days, and marvelled at the occurrence. Then in the month of Chittirai of the year Īśvara (A.D .1757), Khan Sahib Commandant who had gone to Tinnevelly surrounded Madura with 1,000 Europeans of Dēvanāmpaṭṭaṇam, and the fort was besieged in the month of Chittirai to Āvaṇi. People were put to much trouble and Barakadulla, who remained in the fort, descended the walls of the fort and reached Tribhuvanam*. Both Kanusahib (Khan-Sahib) and Muttaḷagu Piḷḷai, son of Mīnākṣinātha Piḷḷai of Tiriśirapuram (Trichinopoly) fort went round the city and the temple gates. He sought the presence of Khansahib and impressed him that the temples of the city being very ancient deserved to be treated in customary Karnatic Hindu fashion. Then the lands of the temple were restored to 'the Seven temples', and the necessary purificatory ceremonies were performed to the gods and the temple of *Tiru-ālavāi* (the great Śiva temple). The tent (*niśan*) of the fakir at the Rāyagōpuram was pulled down and the fakir himself driven, after sound beating, beyond the mound outside the town. To the daily service of the gods, the processional car, festivals etc., 12,000 *pon* was given at the rate of 1,000 *pon* for a month in addition to the grant of villages for the temple service and food offerings. As it was going on in this manner the Europeans of Pondicherri (the French) and those of Dēvanāmpaṭṭaṇam

---

* This obviously refers to the attack and capture of Madura by Caillaud and Yusufkhan in A.D. 1757. But the Mindankhan or Maindan Khan of the Pāṇḍyan chronicle is Khumandan Khan Sahib of this and stands for Commandant Khan Sahib which stands again for Yusuf Khan. See Ch. VI of *Yusuf Khan.*

(Fort St. David) get into a state of hostility, and as the Puduchēri Europeans (the French) were in possession of the Fort St. David territory as far as Trichinopoly, Khan Sahib and Muttaḷagu Piḷḷai proceeded from here to Trichinopoly and destroyed the French, and took possession of the country in their occupation. On reaching Fort St. David, the captain conferred on them all honours and gave them rewards. They then returned to Madras in the month of Vaikāśi of the Pramādi year (A.D. 1759).

From the year Chitrabhānu 1712 the temple managers took charge of the lands and provided 1,000 *pon* a year for the temple worship. From Subhānu Puraṭṭāśi, to Puraṭṭāśi of Tāraṇa. A.D. 1763-4 Colonel Preston of Madras besieged the fort of Madura with many Europeans and Nawabs Muhammad Alikhan Sahib, and Mafuskhan Sahib, Sētupati, Uḍayadēvar (Śivaganga), the Toṇḍaimān, and other *polegārs*. In the 3rd of Aippaśi, Tāraṇa of Śaka 1684 current A.D. 1764, Muhammad Alikhan Sahib entered the fort having captured and hanged Muhammad Yusuf Khan. Then the temple-management and all the principal residents went in a body to meet him. The revenue officer (Amil) Abdul Khan of Madura received orders to provide the seven temples with 7,000 *pon* a year, and lands and villages were granted likewise, and a sum of Rs. 500 was given for the purificatory ceremony of the temple. In this manner the Government of Abdul Khan Sahib lasted for seven years from Tāraṇa to Vikṛti (A.D. 1764–70). From Kara to Hēviḷambi (A.D. 1770–77), Mohidin-Sahib's government lasted. The government of Mallāri Rāyar (Malhari Rao) lasted for—(?). Then Dubash Venkaṭēśvara Mudaliyār

undertook to provide for the temple worship and conducted the temple services with 6,000 *pon*.

The government of Kadar Sahib lasted for a year in Viḷambi (A.D. 1778). Kayala-Behu-Khan Sahib's government lasted for a year in Vikāri (A.D. 1779). From Śārvari to Plava (A.D. 1779–81), Mallāri Rāyar's government lasted for two years. For three years from Subhakṛt to Krōdhi (A.D. 1781–84) in the days of Master Dorien, the temple worship was conducted under the control of Venkaṭarāyar with 6,000 *pon* as determined before, and all necessary temple grants and villages were made as before. In the year Viśvāvasu (A.D. 1785), Segu Muhammad Sahib carried on the government as a revenue officer on his own responsibility. In Plavanga (A.D. 1787) Rāmaswāmi Ayyan enjoyed power. Subbārāyar was in possession of power from Kīlaka to Saumya, Māśi (A.D. 1788-89.) From Panguni of Saumya to Sādhāraṇa, Āvaṇi (A.D. 1789-80) Rāmaswāmi Ayyan enjoyed power. From Puraṭṭāśi (A.D. 1790) it came into possession of the Company and Master Macleod (Alexander Macleod) till Virōdhikṛt (A.D. 1791.) During his stay things were conducted according to the *parvana* of the Nawab. Then Kadar Sahib excercised power in the year Parītāpi (A.D. 1792). For the next two years from Pramādhīcha to Ānanda (A.D. 1793-94) Rāmaswāmi Ayyan exercised power. For the next two years Rākṣasa and Naḷa (A.D. 1794-95) Treasurer Venkaṭarāyar exercised power.

For two years Pingaḷa and Kāḷayukti (A.D. 1797-98) Rāmaswāmi Ayyan exercised power. In the year Siddhārti (A.D. 1799), Ravo Pandit was in power. Till then the temple was conducted as usual with regard to villages

granted for expenses for general management and those for food supply. From Raudri Āni to Durmukhi Āḍi 23rd (A.D. 1801), Rangarāyar exercised power on behalf of Mir Astekhan Bahadur. They also conducted religious worship according to custom. Then from 34th Āḍi of Durmukhi (A.D. 1801) the Honourable Company obtained power and conducted things according to *māmūl*.

In Śaka 1723 Kali 4(90)2, Durmukhi Āḍi, 24th, the land coming under the possession of the Company, Collector Mēlūr Artis Sahib (Thomas Bower Hurdis) came to Madura. Sub-officer M.R.Ry, Kyana Sahib and Peishkar Bhima Rāyar, and Nārayana Rāyar, Peishkar of Madura, came to the place. Division officer Kyana Sahib arrived on the 25th. As the whole land was in the possession of the Company Kyana Sahib held court in the Palace Hall. Everyone paid respect to them and obeyed their rule.

[*Presented to the Indian Historical Records Commission at the Sixth Session, 1924, Sir Evan Cotton in the Chair. Reprinted from the Commission's Proceedings, pp. 104-116.*]

N.B.—This chronicle in quaint Tamil was translated in the first instance, by Mr. R. Gopalam, M.A., University Research Student. I revised it throughout and added the notes.

The Rise of the Mahratta Power in the South

It was Akbar's vision of empire which has to be regarded as perhaps the root cause of the rise of the Mahrattas to political power, and it may equally well be considered that the collapse of the Hindu empire of Vijayanagar was as much of a contributory, as the Mughal advance in the Dakhan, to the Mahrattas as a nation and as a political power in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Akbar conceived his empire not exactly as an empire of the Mughals in India, but as an Indian empire, in which the Mughals, Afghans and the Hindus alike were citizens on an equal footing politically, and entitled to be regarded as the subjects of an Indian empire. The conception of such an empire seems to have come early to Akbar, and there is evidence in the earliest act of even young Akbar as emperor when he was moved towards the accomplishment of this ideal. He almost began after the dismissal of Bairām Khan from his position of authority and the overthrow of Adham Khan, getting rid thereby of sinister influences in the way of this ideal. The first practical steps which he took were to accept the Hindus as his own subjects, as much entitled to privileges of position and power as his own Mughals, and, needless to say, as the Afghans. In the course of carrying this idea into practice, he experienced the difficulties of antagonism in religion as prejudicial to the bringing about of that complete unity

among his subjects, which for some little time perhaps exercised its opiate influence upon his imperial mind. That is what induced him, after elaborate preparation by way of open discussions and arguments between the best votaries of the prevalent religions of the land, to formulate a common religion for all. That religion was matter not capable of being thus ordered even by imperial authority was borne in upon him, when perhaps the most intimate among his courtiers plainly told him. after all his travail, that this was a hopeless feat. Bhagavāndās is said to have made the remark : 'Islam I understand, Hinduism I know, but this new religion, I protest, I do not understand,' thus putting the whole position in a nutshell. Religion is not made to order, except for agnostics and plain atheists. It is something more secretive and has an appeal to much beyond reason. That was a truth which was recognized in India ages ago ; and the religion of each one was left entirely to himself alone. That was the cardinal principle which contributed to the success of Hindu administration during the best of its days. Rulers regarded themselves as the preservers of the *Dharma*, not the propounders and the promulgators thereof. In a country of the vastness and variety of India, even admitting that it never was under an empire as a whole before the establishment of the British Empire, any other principle would have been impossible as an operative principle of action. This truth Akbar learned when his Dīn Ilāhī failed, and, like a statesman of distinct vision, he learned the truth and laid it to heart, and did not go into sackcloth and ashes, like a fanatic, to mourn the sad fate which had overtaken his pet scheme. The empire of India that he wanted to form fell short, to this extent, of

the unity that he wanted to impart to it; but short of this, his liberal policy had knitted it as closely as may be, and had put it on a footing on which it showed promise of permanence.

On this basis, having firmly established himself in the Indian empire of Hindustan, the next natural effort would be to make the attempt, which failed before under Muhammad-bin-Tughlaq, of extending the empire to take into it peninsular India as well. The first effort at expansion was the successful advance across the Vindhyas and the establishment, without much ado, of a viceroyalty of the Dakhan at Burhānpūr. To the Dakhan states, which were Islamic in character though of another form, the expansion of imperial authority meant their incorporation in the imperial rule and therefore political extinction. The states fought as hard as they could, but succumbed to the imperial forces when the time came. Akbar's policy of expansion was pursued by his successors. Jahāngīr in his own way tried to go a step further and employed in the enterprise the most promising among his sons, who ultimately succeeded to the throne and carried out the policy of his father still further; so that at the unexpected termination of Shah Jahan's rule, the two Mussalman States, Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa, were alone left in the Dakhan. The three states which had been overthrown successfully had been incorporated in the viceroyalty of the Dakhan, which gave the surest indication of what the states could expect by submission to imperial authority. The two states therefore felt that they must fight to the bitter end and be extinguished fighting, rather than

undergo the political extinction, which, as they might well imagine, submission to the Mughal Empire meant. In this fight naturally they utilized all their resources, and the Mahrattas as such emerged into view as auxiliaries rendering valiant services in this cause of Dakhani independence of the Indian empire of the Great Mughal.

Ever since the overthrow of Yādava Rāmdēv by Alaud-din and the flaying alive of his son-in-law Harapāla, the Mahrattas lost their independence. The planting of military colonies, as it were, of the 'Amīrs of 100' by Mubārak Khalji drove another nail into the coffin of their independence. Politically therefore they had become extinct as a nation; but in practical life they played a very considerable part in the administration of the Islamic states of the Bahmani Kingdom as a whole, and rose to rank and importance even in some of the separate states into which this kingdom broke up. They were found largely employed even in the State of Bidar under the Bahmani Sultans themselves. It was a quarrel between the Mahratta Controller of the finances and Yusuf Ādil Shah, the general which brought about the rebellion which ultimately dismembered the Bahmani kingdom. They found scope for further service in the States of Bijapur and Ahmadnagar particularly, and it is common knowledge that Shahji began his career as a petty military commander and *jāgīrdār* in the state of Ahmadnagar. A valiant man in comparatively humble circumstances, he naturally looked up to those high in position, and, through the agency of another Mahratta chieftain, who had influence at court, he found opportunity for honourable entry into service and

for achieving distinction in the wars which Ahmadnagar had to wage against the Mughals. Unfortunately for him, Ahmadnagar was too far gone to appreciate even the valiant services of a loyal officer of its own. Shahji's achievements only provoked jealousy and, instead of meeting rewards for services rendered, he found that he had the counteracting machinations of court intriguers aginst him. He tried his fortunes with the other rival state, Bijapur. There again, he achieved the same distinction, and he met with almost the same kind of a reward. After trying his fortunes with Ahmadnagar, once again chastened after defeat, he found he was in no better position to prosecute his ambition for a career and changed again to Bijapur. There was the possibility of service in the empire. He might have elected to enter imperial service and risen to a certain degree of importance. Had he done that, as in fact he attempted to do in A. D. 1637, Shahji might have ended his days as the holder of a big *mansab* in the empire at the very best, not without the possibility of an inglorious end to a brilliant career, having regard to his character and high ambition. Fortune had willed it otherwise. Shahji finally threw in his lot with Bijapur, which first gave him an opportunity to round off his small estate by further accretions of territory, so that in Mahārāshtra he could count himself a Sardār of a fairly high rank. It was then that the terrritory south of the two Mussalman kingdoms opened out vistas for accomplishing his ambition, and Shahji found an opportunity to take the tide at the full flood.

The empire of Vijayanagar, which had suffered a shattering blow at the hands of the united Muhammadan

states of the dismembered Bahmani kingdom in the battle of Talikota so-called, was able soon to rehabilitate her resources and restore herself, in the course of a score of years, to something of the position that she had held before as arbiter of the fortunes of the Islamic states. Tirumala, who fled from Vijayanagar soon after the battle of Rākshasatangaḍi, ordinarily called Talikota, regained his power so far that, from Penugoṇḍa as his capital, he began to exercise the same commanding authority for intervention in the affairs of the Bahmani kingdoms. At the end of the sixteenth century therefore Vijayanagar still was an important power capable of using and willing to use her power as before in regard to the Muhammadan kingdoms. On the contrary, the two Muhammadan states in the immediate neighbourhood had pursued a policy, with the advantage that they acquired after the great battle, of not playing into the hands of the Hindu power. They came to an understanding in the course of the years which followed the battle that in their career of expansion they ought to follow a policy of respecting each other's spheres of activity. Bijapur was allowed for its share of expansion the plateau region covering the greater half of the Mysore plateau on the eastern side and leading into the middle country of Tamil India, the South Arcot District of to-day. Golkoṇḍa had for its sphere the whole of the Karnāṭak below the Ghats leading southwards to Madras and terminating with perhaps the southern borders of the Chingleput District. Each of them therefore laid itself out to pursue a policy of aggression along the lines thus indicated and ultimately to bring the Hindu state to extinction. They were prosecuting this policy with vigour, and, if not with immediate success, at

least with chances of assured ultimate success. Tirumala passed away and was succeded by his son Śrīranga some time about A.D. 1575. Śrīranga had had work to do against Golkoṇḍa. He had to fight and win many battles to keep the power of Golkoṇḍa within limits. He had also reverses of a very serious character.* He fell into the hands of the Muhammadans and was taken prisoner. He was rescued by the efforts of a loyal chieftain, a feudatory of the empire. Occupied as he was in this fashion, he provided for the administration, of the empire creating two viceroyalties, one at Srirangapatam, which controlled all the territory on the plateau extending northwards to the frontiers of the Southern Mahratta country. The other viceroyalty had its headquarters at Chandragiri. This viceroyalty had for its sphere of authority extending southwards along the plains down to the extreme south.† When Śrīranga died, Golkoṇḍa's expansion did not go very much beyond the Krishna, which marked the boundary on this side. Even Bijapur was kept more or less within her bounds. The exposed parts however were under the direct rule of the empire including as they did the viceroyalties of Udayagiri, Penugoṇḍa and Vijayanagar itself or Haḷēbīḍ, as it used to be called before that, and the plateau part at any rate Muḷbāgal. These were earlier provincial governments, and it is because of the warlike operations which were necessary in this region that the south was otherwise provided for. When Śrīranga died, the empire was left more or less intact. The next brother Rāma, who was viceroy at Srirangapatam, had died before him, leaving the viceroyalty to his eldest son, Tirumula.

* *Sources of Vijayanagar History*, p. 232.

† *Ibid*, p. 302.

The next brother was Venkaṭapati, who was viceroy at Chandragiri. He had with him his younger nephew, the brother of Tirumala and being the eldest member of the family and the only surviving brother of four, he succeeded to the empire at the death of Śrīranga.

Venkaṭapati died in the year A.D. 1614. During the score of years and more of his reign, he managed to keep the empire intact, and there is a record of his having stood a siege in Penugoṇḍa which he ultimately managed to beat off with great success with the assistance of Rāṇa Jagadēva Rāyal, the viceroy of Channapaṭna and the Bāramahāls and Raghunātha Nāyaka, the heir-apparent of Tanjore. The empire, however, suffered a dismemberment in that the viceroyalty of Srirangapatam underwent an extinction, as it were, and a new family of rulers, the Woḍēyārs of Mysore set themselves up instead with the countenance, as it seems, of the emperor himself. Beyond these and the successful aggressions of the Golkoṇḍa rules in the north-eastern corner of the territory, the empire remained intact. His death brought about a disputed succession which rent the empire in twain and left it permanently damaged. Venkaṭapati married four queens, but apparently had no children by any of them. One of them who belonged to the family of Gobbūri chiefs, claimed to have brought forth a son and was bringing him up as their child. Venkaṭapati himself seems to have shared the general unbelief in regard to the matter and continued to bring up his nephew, Ranga, the brother of the Srirangapatam viceroy and son of his elder brother Rāma, almost as his adopted son, and had even raised him to the dignity to *Chikkarāya* (*Yuvarāja*),

meaning either prince, or perhaps, the prince heir-apparent. According to contemporary accounts, Venkaṭapati on his death-bed declared this Chikkarāya as his successor and handed over to him the imperial seal. For the moment the other party led by Gobbūri Jagga, the brother of the queen concerned, was silenced. The discontented powers in the empire rallied round the infant son and were only waiting for an opportunity to overthrow the reigning ruler. Jagga managed to work himself into the confidence of the new ruler and found a suitable opportunity to put an end to the emperor and all his children and secure the throne for his own nephew. Practically all the governors of provinces, big and small, joined in this disloyal enterprise excepting one chief, Yāchama Nāyaka, who was in touch with the court and had heard of the plot. He managed, through the good offices of the imperial washerman, to smuggle one of the boys, the second of the three sons of the emperor, out of the palace in which the royal family was held in prison by Jagga. The only ruler of importance on whose loyalty Yāchama Nāyaka depended was, as mentioned already, the ruler of Tanjore, Achyutappa Nāyaka, and his son Raghunātha, who played an important part in his father's administration.* Yāchama Nāyaka therefore wanted to carry the prince off for sefety to Tanjore. Getting wind of this, Jagga attacked and defeated him in the field, but Yāchama dodged his pursuers successfully and reached Kumbhakonam in safety, wherefrom an escort sent from Tanjore met them and took the prince and Yāchama Nāyaka into Tanjore to safety. This led naturally to Jagga's organizing his party, and a great battle was fought just two

* Extracts 86, 90 and 94, *Jouranl of India History*, Vol. v, p. 164 ff.

miles above the Grand Anicut of to-day, where the confederated enemies were defeated in behalf of Rāma, the prince. Among the enemies, the principal were the Gobbūri chiefs, who were the leaders, along with the other petty chiefs excepting perhaps those of Venkaṭagiri and Kāḷahasti in the territory dependent on the empire. The newly-founded family of Mysore stood aloof. We do not hear of the viceroy of Channapaṭna taking any part. The Nāyak of Gingee took a very prominent part, and ultimately fell in the battle. So did the Nāyak of Madura; and, if the Tanjore account is correct, there was even a Portuguese contingent on the side of the malcontents. This movement and its result damaged the empire much more than anything else, and threw the gate open for the entry of the Muhammadan neighbours more effectively into the imperial territory. This Rāmarāja succeeded, however, in tiding over his difficulties through the assistance of Tanjore so long as Tanjore maintained itself in full power. But Tanjore itself was at constant war with the Madura chiefs, and this intermittent warfare ultimately weakened both states. This weakness of Tanjore diminished the power of resistance of the empire and paved the way to its downfall.

The breakdown of the viceroyalty of Channapaṭna prevented the newly-founded kingdom of Mysore, obviously occupied by Bijapur movements on the northern side, from taking any part in the general *mēleē* in the empire. Whatever it was, we may take it that the Bijapur movements began to be more active and disconcerting. The empire being involved in its own struggle for existence, the distant chiefs were thrown upon their own resources for defending

themselves against the enemies on the north. This gave an opportunity at once for distinction, which would lead on ultimately to independence. It was about this period that the chiefship of Ikkēri, Keḷadi or Bednore was coming into prominence. The Channapaṭna viceroyalty was the first to suffer by the Bijapur invasions. Invaders from Bijapur seem to have begun their attacks on the territories under the Government of Bednore. Gradually absorbing the territory which constituted afterwards the Nawabship of Sira, they marched southwards against the territory dependent upon Channapaṭna and Bangalore, and they were able to overthrow that by a series of invasions first under Ranadullah Khan and then under Mustafa Khan, the general-agents of Bijapur. The Bijapur armies were able to march farther south-east to the end of Bāramahāl and Salem districts, which constituted a part of the government of the viceroy at Channapaṭna and advanced from there into the province of Gingee, destined to play a very important part in the history of the Mahrattas. This process took a considerable number of years and was not complete before A.D. 1649, when Gingee actually fell into the hands of the invaders.

In the meanwhile, Golkoṇḍa activities began to receive a fresh stimulus through the genius of a new minister, well-known to history later on as Mir Jumla; Golkoṇḍa made gradual advance till it took possession of the territory round Pulicat, the Dutch settlement not far off, and absorbed all the territory right down to the province of Kāḷahasti and Conjīvaram in the immediate neighbourhood of Madras. It was this double pressure, one from the

eastern, and the other from the western half of the northern frontier of the empire, which occupied all the available time and energy of the imperial headquarters and left the larger viceroyalties of the south to pursue their own particular plans of self-aggrandizement without much fear of active intervention on the imperial side. This general aspect of the forces in operation must be borne in mind in any discussion of the activities of any of these individual provincial governors, or of even the interloping activities of states like Bijapur. Rāma was succeeded by another Venkaṭa about A.D. 1632–3, and it was he who was responsible for granting the charter to the two factors of the English East India Company, Cogan and Day, for erecting the factory at Fort St. George, which more than a century and a half later blossomed into the Madras Presidency of to-day.

The accession of this second Venkaṭapati to power was almost coincident with important changes in the frontiers of the the Dakhan. The kingdom of Ahmadnagar passed out of existence in A.D. 1633, and just three or four years later, the war for the division of Ahmadnagar spoils between the Mughals on the one side and the Sultans of Bijapur and the Mahrattas on the other came to an end by the definitive treaty entered into between the parties, arranged by the emperor Shah Jahan. It was this treaty and the specific obligations it imposed upon the powers concerned that set Bijapur free from the entanglements of the Mughals, as it did Golkoṇḍa to some extent, though Golkoṇḍa was not directly concerned. It was after this arrangement that Shahji the Mahratta cast in his lot with

the state of Bijapur and entered its service with the influential support of the commander-in-chief Ranadullah Khan and his chief adviser Morar Pant. Shahji's entry into Bijapur service was followed almost immediately by Bijapur activities in the territory of what at persent constitutes the state of Mysore.

To understand what brought about this Bijapur intervention, a short retrospect of the history of Mysore is required. The state of Mysore came into being with the capture of Srirangapatam by Rāja Woḍēyār in A.D. 1610. The possession of Srirangapatam was ratified by a charter issued by the emperor Venkaṭapatirāya just at a time when his position at Penugoṇḍa was actively threatened by a vigorous Golkoṇḍa attack. Whether there was any connection between the one and the other or not, Venkaṭapatirāya accepted the accomplished fact and allowed Rāja Woḍēyār to rule the territory which hitherto was under the viceroy at Srirangapatam in A.D. 1612. This charge comprised at least two governments, possibly three, viz.,—(1) that under Srirangapatam itself; and (2) the territory with its headquarters at Channapaṭna, which happened to be under a governor, Jagadēva Rāyal, who gradually extended the little province by the accession of the so-called Bāramahāl districts of Salem. On the north, this territory seems to have taken in the area ruled over by the Nāyak of Ikkēri, not to :mention the petty chieftains and *Poḷigārs* between Ikkēri and the forntiers of Srirangapatam. But Rāja Woḍēyār's claims to all these were not acknowledged without question. He was able to take actual possession of Srirangapatam; and unless he took

similar possession of the others also, he could not well establish his title. But Rāja Woḍēyār, active man that he was, was not able to accomplish all these things in his life-time. It was left to his successor, his grandson, Chāmarāja Woḍēyār by name, to achieve gradually the conquest of the territory immediately adjoining his own, that is, the Channapaṭna viceroyalty without the Bāramahāls, and having acquired this, he made an attempt upon the territory of Ikkēri. But Ikkēri was able to defend herself so long as the northern frontier was safe. Chāmarāja was not able to accomplish much in that direction before he died. What he failed to do, his successor tried to effect. In order to divert the attention of his Ikkēri contemporary he brought about a Bijapur invasion, from which he had himself to suffer. Among the petty *Poḷigārs* who surrounded the territory of Ikkēri was one ruler by name Kengē Hanuma of Basavapaṭṭaṇa. This general and other discontented *Poḷigārs* in the neighbourhood were set up against Vīrabadra Nāyaka of Ikkēri by Kanṭhīrava Narasa. Vīrabhadra quelled the rebellion and dispossessed Kengē Hanuma, referred to in Persian authorities as Kengē Nāyaka, of his own *Pāḷayam*. The latter went to Bijapur to solicit the aid of the *Padushah* there. He found there another *Poḷigār*, Channayya of Nāgamangala, similarly dispossessed by Chāmarāja Woḍēyār himself. The one invitation and the other prevailed against such doubts as the Bijapur court entertained as to the wisdom of this intervention, as about this time, A.D. 1638–39, the definitive treaty dictated by Shah Jahan had established peace on the northern frontiers of Bijapur. The invitation was accepted and the first invasion of Mysore was undertaken. The

commander-in-chief of Bijapur, Ranadullah Khan, was despatched at the head of 40,000 men for the purpose of reinstating Kengē Hanuma. Having succeeded easily in doing this, the Bijapur army marched onward, taking possession of the three provinces of Ikkēri, Sira and Bangalore, the last being under the viceroyalty of the great Jagadēva Rāyal, lately conquered by the rulers of Mysore. Having succeeded in taking possession of these, as it is claimed, the army laid siege to Mysore and Srirangapatam simultaneously. The siege was prosecuted with great vigour, but the defence was eqally vigorous. Ultimately the whole campaign ended in a treaty, which left the Mysore ruler all the territory south of the Kāvēri, that on the north of the river being taken over by Bijapur; that is, Mysore lost her new conquests in the province of Jagadēva Rāyal. This invasion is said to have taken place in the year of Kanṭhīrava Narasa's accession, that is A.D. 1638–39. Though Kanṭhīrava Narasa agreed to the humiliating treaty in his distress, he seems never to have thought of fulfilling it, as his subsequent attitude would clearly show. Ranadullah Khan, on the contrary, considering the arrangement satisfactory, left Kengē Hanuma in charge of the newly-acquired territory and returned to Bijapur. It was now the turn for Vīrabhadra Nāyaka of Ikkēri to appeal to headquarters. He sent an ambassador to Bijapur and pointed out the unsatisfactory character of the arrangements and the unreliability of Kengē Hanuma, the agent left by Ranadullah Khan. A Commission of which Nāgamangala Channayya was a member was appointed to conduct an enquiry. Hanuma was none too ready to facilitate the enquiry, and Kanṭhīrava

Narasa showed as little inclination to act up to the treaty. Kengē Hanuma managed to get rid of the only member of the Commission who had knowledge of the locality and was likely to be troublesome. This management seems to have brought Ranadullah Khan into disgrace, and another general was sent in his stead. This commander-in-chief and his successor Mustafa Khan were both alike unable to do much against Srirangapatam, which had been completely repaired and put into condition for standing a much longer siege than the previous one. A subsequent invasion by Abdullah Khan and Hemaji Paṇḍit did nothing more than occupy the post of Turuvēkere, north-east of the Mysore district of to-day for a short time. The turn had now come for Kanṭhīrava Narasa to break out of the boundary by which he was confined. He marched eastwards, took back the territory of the Channapaṭna viceroyalty, and entering the territory of Koṅgu; he defeated the guardian of the passes and took possession of Satyamaṅgalam, Sāmbaḷḷi, and Bombaḷḷi, all on the south and west of the Kāvēri, thus coming into hostility with the ruler of Madura. He incorporated territory to the extent of bringing his frontiers into direct touch with those of Ikkēri, Sira and Chittaldrug on the north, Coorg on the west and the Koṅgu country on the south. This was the position during the reign of Kanṭhīrava Narasa of Mysore, that is, through the twenty years* A.D. 1639–59, so far as this area is concerned.

This period of Kanṭhīrava Narasa's activity was almost cœval with the rule of Tirumala Nāyaka, in many respects

* *Ancient India*, S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, pp. 292–5.

perhaps the greatest of the Nāyaks of Madura. Tirumala Nāyaka apparently came to the throne about ten years earlier and had borne an influential part in the administration of Madura some years before that. The great civil war of Vijayanagar consequent on the massacre of the royal family after the death of Venkaṭa I threw all the great Nāyaks excepting the Nāyak of Tanjore into opposition to the empire. During the rule, therefore, of the emperor Rāma and his successor Venkaṭapati II extending from A.D. 1616 to 1642, the position was one of comparative inactivity resulting in no harm to the empire, as the two Mussalman powers in the neighbourhood were occupied in their own struggles against the advancing tide of the Mughals. Venkaṭapati during his life-time pursued a plicy of non-intervention, letting his feudatories fight it out among themselves, if need be, unmolested from the imperial head-quarters. This is how we can explain the aggressions of Rāja Woḍēyār, and particularly his successor Chāmarāja Woḍēyār against the province of Channapaṭna and the Bāramahāls. Chāmarāja advanced as far east as Hoskoṭe which he besieged, but did not capture. In the meanwhile, a change seems also to have come over the southern viceroyalties namely, those of Gingee, Tanjore and Madura. It will be remembered that Tanjore remained thoroughly loyal and was primarily instrumental in setting up Rāmarāja on the throne. After the death of Raghunātha Nāyaka and under his successor, Vijayarāghava, the same relations seem to have continued substantially, Tanjore and Madura fighting out their wars between themselves whenever occasion offered. Throughout the reign of Venkaṭapati, the administration seems to have been carried on for him

by his brothers-in-law, the Velugōṭi chief of Kāḷahasti. Among these two names figure prominently. Dāmarla Venkaṭa and Dāmarla Ayya. It is the administration of the brothers-in-law, as the Company's correspondence* describes their relationship to Venkaṭa, that seems to have brought Venkaṭapati's administration into some little contempt, as

* *The Dagh-Register, 1640–41*, p. 185 gives an account in some detail, which Sir Wm. Foster describes in the following words:—

'The name of this Nāyak appears to have been Dāmarla Venkaṭadra or Dāmarla Venkaṭappa. The Dutch records use the latter form, which seems the more correct; and they add that he was lord of from twelve to fifteen thousand soldiers; his chief abode, they say, was at "Wandawas" (i.e., Wandiwash, about sixty miles south-west of Madras), but he spent most of his time at court, leaving his brother, Ayappa Nāyak, who resided at Poonamallee (thirteen miles west of Madras), to administer his territories for him. We infer that Dāmarla Venkaṭappa was the chief supporter of the then Rāja of Chandragiri, who, as the representative of the ancient dynasty of Vijayanagar, claimed dominion over all the Nāyaks of the south; and this inference is borne out by an entry in a list compiled at Fort St. George in 1750 of the old Madras farmans and grants, noted the grant obtained by Day, which is stated to have been given by "Dāmarla Moodu Venkaṭapa (*sic*) Naick, son of Dāmarla Chenama Naick, the Grand Vizier of the foresaid sovereign (i. e. the Chandragiri Rāja) and Lord General of Carnatica" (*Treaties*, vol. vi). . . . It is clear that Dāmarla Venkaṭappa was a person of great influence whom neither the Dutch nor the Portuguese could hope to intimidate, and whose support would be of great value to the proposed English settlement.'

'In a later volume (*The Dagh-Register, 1643–44*, p. 244) the yearly value of the Nāyak's district is put at about 6,00,000 *pardaos*. Ayappa Nāyak is described in the 1641–42 volume of the same series (pp. 272, 289), as brother-in-law of the then "King of Carnatica," i. e. the Rāja Venkaṭapati.' (See note 2, p. xxxvii, *The English Factories in India 1637–41*).

the viceroys seemed to have pursued their own policies unmolested by the Emperor. It is in these circumstances that the chief factors of the East India Company, with its chief factory at Armagam at the time, obtained a charter which gave them Fort St. George and laid the foundations of the southern Presidency. The Viceroy Dāmarla Venkaṭa, with his headquarters at Wandiwash, was ruler of a big province with a very large revenue. He remained, however, at headquarters and directed the administration for the emperor. His province was actually managed by his brother Ayyappa, who seems to have held the government of Poonamallee, thirteen miles west of Madras. It was from these two that was obtained the grant of Fort St. George, which, in the Company's correspondence, is ascribed to the great Nāyaka Dāmarla Venkaṭa. Naturally, therefore, when king Venkaṭa died childless, the brothers-in-law were not anxious that his nephew Śrīranga should succeed. They seem to have ingratiated themselves with the other governors and brought about a possibility of united action in opposition to this succession. Venkaṭa died in October, 1642, and after a delay of about a month or two, Śrīranga succeeded to the throne.* The discontent among the viceroys in regard to this

* 'The Golkoṇḍa army had overrun part of his territory, and the rest (including Armagon itself) had been occupied by a neighbouring Nāyak, to whom apparently the defence of the frontier had been entrusted by his uncle, Venkaṭapati, the King of Vijayanagar. At the beginning of October the King died, and after a short delay this nephew was elevated to the throne as Śrīranga Rāyalu, though many of the other Nāyaks were opposed to his succession, and gave him a great deal of trouble.'

'The Naique of Armagon is absolutely beaten out of all his country, it being possest part by the Kinge of Golquondah(s) people and

succession showed itself immediately. The reason seems to have been that Śrīranga somehow already showed himself to be a man who disapproved strongly of the policy of the *roi faineant*, his predecessor, and wanted to pursue a more vigorous policy by bringing about the active union of all the provinces of the empire under the lead of the emperor himself.* This was not exactly a mere personal predilection of the emperor. The circumstances of 1642 actually demanded the pursuit of a more vigorous policy than that of the score of years previous. The definitive treaty between the Muhammadan states of the Dakhan and the Mughals set free the states of Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa on the northern side, and their intervention was sought no doubt against the Nāyak of Ikkēri by Kanṭhīrava Narasa of Mysore. Bijapur showed itself quite ready to intervene in the affairs of the south. Either about that time or a little later, it seems to have been more or less as a direct result of the accession of Śrīranga, that Tirumala Nāyaka made a similar appeal to Golkoṇḍa for intervention. Tirumala Nāyaka's policy must

---

the major part by Rayalwar. The Moores have encamped themselves, or rather seated themselves for the warr, at a place called Cowle Geldancke, the chiefest place in all that country; and Rayalwar hath a strong garrison Vinquatagery and Armagon. Indeed, wee are of opinion that the Moores will have all this country ere many years: for what with the Kinge of Vizapore (Bijapur) on one side and the Kinge of Gonquondah on the other, the Gentues themselves being divided among themselves, it is even impossible their country cann continue.'

O. C. 1792 contains substantially the same information in a slightly different version. See note 2 on p. 44. (See *The English Factories in India, 1642–45*, p. xxviii and p. 44 respectively.)

* See paper on Śrīranga by R. Satyanatha Aiyar, *Proceedings of the Third Oriental Conference*, Madras, pp. 365–75.

have been directed by the movements of Mysore which, under Chāmarāja, the predecessor of Kanṭhīrava, had, as already stated, been active in the direction of Channapaṭna, The next advance of Mysore would be into the Koṅgu, directly menacing the northern frontier of Madura. Whether this led Tirumala to bring about the invasion of Mysore soon after the succession of Kanṭhīrava Narasa does not appear clear in our authorities. But that he pursued the policy of his predecessor, namely of hostility towards the empire, and sought the intervention of Golkoṇḍa soon after the accession of Śrīranga is fairly on record. Tirumala Nāyaka's effort to bring about the alliance of Gingee, Tanjore and Madura, failed through Tanjore betraying the secret to the empire, and Tirumala turned for assistance to Golkoṇḍa, aud contrived that an attack should be made therefrom upon Vellore.* It was probably during this attack that Śivappa Nāyaka marched from Ikkēri to the assistance of the emperor and caused the Golkoṇḍa army to raise the siege. It was then that Śrīranga realized that he must somehow or other instil into the southern feudatories a policy of loyalty to the empire. The accession of Śrīranga naturally brought about the dismissal of the most powerful of the two brothers, Dāmarla Venkaṭa, from his position of authority. Dāmarla Venkaṭa, as early as 1642† hardly two months after the

* See *The Nāyaks of Madura*, by R. Satyanatha Aiyar, pp. 126-35.

† 'The warrs and broyls increasing in this countrie, and now (by reason of our Great Naiques imprisonment(¹) drawing nere to us, wee

1. 'Dāmarla Venkaṭappa had been detected in intrigues with Golkoṇḍa and had thereupon been imprisoned by the new King and deprived of all his territory, with the exception of Punamallee and the surrounding districts (see p. 80); also *The Dagh-Register, 1643-44*, p. 244 (*The English Factories in India, 1642-45*, p. 70).

succession of Śrīranga, intrigued with Golkoṇḍa and was put under arrest by Śrīranga's orders; but his powerful brother Ayyappa brought pressure to bear from both the northern and southern provinces in 1643, and the Company's records mention that Venkaṭa was likely to be released on account of this pressure.* It was then that

latelie raised a third bulwark of turfe: and wanting gunns to mount thereon, have resolved that the *advice* shall spare us foure minion for that purpose, because there is noe danger of enemie in her way to Bantam, and when shee comes there shee may be againe supplyed.

* 'If this cannot be supplied, the surplus should be returned in gold; for as for other commodities, they will not of (f) of our handes, this countrie being all in broyls, the old Kinge of Karnatt being dead. Soe is the Naique of Armagon, whose countrie is all in the handes of the Moores, and (*sic*) who will ere long by all likelyhood bee maisters of all this countrie; for our Naique, not finding the respect from the new Kinge as he expected, did make profer to assist the Moores; but ere he could bringe his treason about, 'twas discovered (and) he apprehended by the Kinge, who hath seaz'd greate parte of his countrie. But wee beleve hee will be forc'd suddainely to restore it againe and relaease him, for our Naiques brother and kindsmen are levying an armie for his rescue; whoe, with the helpe of the Moores on the other side (whoe are within halfe a dayes a journey of each other[1]) will force his libertie or ruine the whole kingdome.'

(*The English Factories in India*, *1642-45*, p. 80.)

'And from Pullicat about a moneth since a piscash was sent by the hand of their merchant Moileya (alies Chinana Chitty) unto the present King of Karnatt, estimated to be worth 4,000 (pagodas). The Portugauis from St. Thoma have likewise been with theire piscash with the Kinge; but it comes far shorte of the former, for all that they carried could not amount to full 200 pa(godas). Somewhat is expected from us; but until our Naique and the Kinge bee eyther reconcyled or absolutely outed, wee intend to stand uppon our guard and keepe what wee have' (*The English Factories in India, 1642-1645*, p. 81.)

1. Some particulars of the advance of the Golkoṇḍa invaders will be found at p. 344 of the *Dagh-Register* for 1643-44. They had just occupied Venkatagiri. Tha release and reinstatement of Dāmarla are mentioned on p. 255 of the same volume.

Śrīranga sought the assistance, probably of Mysore, but certainly of Bijapur. Bijapur agreed and marched to his relief for a consideration of 1,50,000 pagodas and twenty-four elephants.*

It was about this time that the Company made the first move to get from Śrīranga a confirmation of their charters, after this initial success against Golkoṇḍa and the machinations of Dāmarla Venkata.†

---

*'This countrey hath byn, and still is at present, all in broyles, one Nague against another, and most against the Kinge; which makes all trade at a stand. But the Kinge, by means of the Kinge of Vizapore, whoe for 15 lacke of pagothaes and 24 elephants hath sente some thousands of horse for his assistance, is like to have the better.'—(*The English Factories in India, 1642-45*, pp. 115-6.)

† 'The wars in these parta made them glad to entertain some of these men as soldiers; 'for the Moores but five weekes past had advanced with there armes within three myles of Pullicatt, and sent unto the Dutch Governor to surrender up these castle; and we did suddenly expect the same. But shortly after the Jentues came down with a greate power, gave the Moores battle, rowted there armie and put the Moores to flight beyond Armagon([1]) where they are now agathering a head againe.

1. The Dutch Governor of Pulicat, writing to Batavia some months later, reported that on reaching that fortress from Masulipatam on July 15 (N. S.), he found that the forces of the King of Golkoṇḍa, under 'Casy Aly'? (Kasim Ali), had subdued the whole of the neighbouring towns without opposition and were demanding the submission of Pulicat itself, promising at the same time that the Dutch should retain all their privileges. Of this demand no notice was taken and the invaders, finding the fortress amply equipped, contended themselves with a demonstration at a safe distance. The Nāyak of Ginjee, who was then in rebellion against Śrīranga, advanced with the intention of joining the Golkoṇḍa army; whereupon the King recalled

Śrīranga found the time to undertake active operations against the rebel vassals of the south. There is a note in a letter of the Company's servants, dated October 1645, that Śrīranga had brought the enemies under control and had restored himself to his original position. *

Kistappa Nāyaka, who was operating against the Gingee chief, and restored Chinnana to favour. Kistappa fell unexpectedly on the Moors and completely routed them, killing their commander and several other men of importance. (*Hague Transcripts*, Series i. vol. xiv., No. 431; *The Dagh Register, 1644-45*, p. 325, September, 8, 1644.)

'Nay, such a storme is prepareing for us that tis to bee feared will even whorle us from this coast. Our neighbours the Dutch have bine longe a projecting and now they have wrought it that Mollay, their merchant, is like to bee as powerfull with this King as the Serkayle is att Gulcundah; and, to ingratiate him thoroughly into his favour, they have assisted Mollay with men and guns for the subdueing of castles of our Nague for the king, or rather their owne use; by which means our Nague is cashered and hee substituted, and is allso made his Treasurer and dus even in a manner command all.'

(*The English Factories in India, 1642-45*, pp. 193-4 and note, September 8, 1644; also *Ibid.*, p. 154.)

* 'Wee have bin often tymes sollicited by this Kinge to give him a vissitt, which never was yett done to him or his predecessours since our first arivall heere, which is now seven yeares allmost; sœ, if wee any longer deny his reasonable request, wee may suddainely expect his just displeasure and peradventure have a seidge about us, as our neighbours the Hollanders of one syde and Portugalls of the other, which are seldome free, notwithstanding their great power and defence who hath twenty for one more then wee; sœ that, if the like should happen unto us, what can you expect of 50 well and sicke men to defend your estate and fort against the kings power, when one of his merchants hath queld the Hollanders sœ, that they dare not stirr out of their fort or putt their feete ashoare in this kings dominion? And now the Kinge

It was then that Greenhill's mission went to Vellore and obtained a charter for the grant of Fort St. George. Mir Jumla nominally in behalf of Golkoṇḍa, was not likely to take his defeat quietly. We find him working with

---

himselfe hath taken it to hart, in the behalfe of Mollay, his chief counceller, to commence warrs against the Hollanders. Tyme will produce the event thereof; for it is growne to that height that the Hollander must leave this Kings country, or Mollay fall into utter distruction. Sœ that wee have nothing more to trust unto then our civil comportment and respect to the Kinge and great ones, which hath hetherto prevayled before the Hollanders potencie; and at present are in such esteeme with the Kinge and great ones that the whole trade of his kingdome is proffered unto the Honourable English East India Company. And for the mayntenance of the same and the Kings favour, wee are......resolved within this few dayes to send upp Mr. Henry Greenhill, with foure other English souldiers for his attendance, for the reconfirmation of what was graunted unto Mr. Cogan by the Great Nague, under whose protection formerly wee liv'd, but now the Kinge hath taken his power and this cuntry from him; sœ that his power and protection is of nœ longer vallue. Sœ now findeing a fitting oppertunity, wee doubt not but to have our old priviledges reconfirm'd, with the addition of a great many more, by this now reigneing Kinge, which hath brought all his great lords unto his comand, which hath not bin this 40 yeares before. This by Mollayes assistance wee make nœ question to obtayne. And another reason for the sending of Mr. Greenhill to the Kinge is because that our powerfull friends the Governur etc., of Pullecatt would make us beleive that Mollay is a villiane and a heighway robber and that wee, in receiveing those goods of our merchants which Mollay hath stollen and sould to them, are as bad as hee, and therefore will take those goods out of our shipps wheresœver they meete them, and to this effect hath given their commissions to all their commanders to search out shipps wheresœver they meete them, thinkeing thus to buncke us out of 400 bales of goods which our merchants hath in Fort St. George and at our washers in possession; sœ should wee disapoint our Surratt President of his Mocho shipps ladeinge of goods (and better goods wee know

Bijapur as against Śrīranga. He also made proposals to Kanṭhīrava Narasa of Mysore for assistance. We find a

hee cannot have for that place). Therefore, untill wee have his approbation, wee are resolved to our power to maynetayne our merchants in that just cause that wee well know they are in, in regard wee finde they dœ truely indeavour your proffitt and their owne creddитts; and for these goods, wee well know they have paid to the uttermost vallue of them, and sœ must wee likewise. Therefore, because the Hollanders shall not say that wee are the receivers of stollen goods, wee dœ send Mr. Greenhill and four other English men unto the Kinge, to beseech his hand and signett to testifie to the whole world that Mollay is nœ villiane nor thiefe, and what warr is commenced against the Hollanders is by His Majesties command, as well as the goods taken from his subjects belongiug to the Hollanders, sould by his officers with the same command. Sœ that when wee have this from the Kinge under his owne hand and signett, and that by his owne hand is delivered when wee shall have sent the coppie thereof to the Governour of Pullecatt, hee will no longer threaten us for the receiveinge of stollen goods.'

The King of Vijayanager at 'Arlour' to the Agent at Fort St. George. September 25, 1645 (O. C. 1948)

'Zree Seringo Raylo, King of Kings, a God in his kingdome, in armes invincible, etc., unto the Captain of the English, these. The Hollanders, who have their residence in Pallacatt, not valuinge my letters, hath constrained mee to commence awarre against them, the charge whereof is committed unto Chenana Chetty (Malaya: see p. 50), whom you are to assist therein with artillery, powder, shott, fireworks; and in sœ doing you shall pleasure us. Whatever goods appertained unto the Hollanders in my kingdome I accompt it as my peculiar and proper wealth which, being all come to Madraspatam, wee will that you buy and pay monies for the same, proceeding therein as Chenana Chetty and Seradra shall prescribe, not failing at all in its performance. And whereas I am given to understand by Chenana Chetty that you intend to send upp a man of quality unto us (I) am very well pleased, for that you have allwaies esteemed my ordinances; and as Chenana Chetty will advize, sœ shall you bee sure to receive content; nor bee you induced

record again, dated January 1646, that Śrīranga was attacked by Golkoṇḍa and Bijapur.*

---

to beleive the contrary, but confide upon our word and along with him; for whose secure repayre unto our court this our firman shall suffice. As for the other matters, Chinana Chetty will advise you.'

'Then comes a long silence, but from the Dutch records we learn that Śrīranga, after suffering a severe defeat under the walls of Vellore, was forced to pay a heavy indemnity to the leader of the Bijapur army, and that the Nāyaks, sobered by the successes of the Muhammadans, returned to their allegiance and promised to assist the King in maintaining the independence of his country.'

(*The English Factories in India, 1642–45*, pp. 289–91 October 1, 1645, and p. 285, Śrīranga's letter; also p. xxv, Volume for 1649–50 of the same series.)

* 'How the warres stand betwixt the King and Vinagar (Vijayanagar) and the Hollanders.' 'Ever since the seige of Pullacatt, which was begune the 12th August last, the King hath bine in warres with the King of Vizapore (Bijapur) and in civell wares with three of his great Nagues; sœ that he to this tyme never had opportunitie to send a considerable foorse against Pullacatt, more then 4,000 souldiers that lay before it to stopp the wayes that no goods should gœ in or out. And now the King of Gulcondah hath sent his generall, Meir Gumlack (Mir Jumla), with a great armie to appose this King; who is advance (d) to the Jentues cuntry. where the King hath sent Mallay, who hath got togeather 50,000 souldiers (as reporte saith), whereof 3,000 souldiers he sent for from Pullacatt, to keepe the Moores from intrenching upon this Kings country.'

'Among the *Hague Transcripts* at the India Office (Series i, vol. xv, No. 484) is an interesting diary kept at Pulicat at this time. According to this the three rebellious Nāyaks were those of Tanjore, Madura, and 'Sinsier [Ginji ?], who inflicted a severe defeat on the royal forces in Decmber, 1645. It also says that the English had sent a mission to court with a present of about 1,000 *pardaos* in spices, looking-glasses, etc., and had promised at the King's request to buy the goods taken from the Dutch. In return they had asked for the confirmation of their *previous qaul and this* had been granted.'

It was then that Mir Jumla was able to take possession of Udayagiri, which was the capital of the eastern viceroyalty from Mallaiya, the successor in command in these parts of Dāmarla Venkaṭa.*

The surrender of Udayagiri threw Mallaiya into disgrace and the change of command in the face of the enemy gave them the advantage. Golkoṇḍa and Bijapur now laid siege to Vellore together and defeated Śrīrangarāya.† Mir

---

* 'This countrey is at present full of warrs and troubles, for the King and three of his Nagues are at varience, and the King of Vizapoores armie is come into this country on the one side and the King of Gulcondah uppon the other, both against this King. The Meir Jumlah is Generall for the King of Gulcondah, whoe hath allreadie taken three of the Kings castles, whereof one of them is reported to bee the strongest hould in this kingdome; where Molay was sent to keepe it, but in a short tyme surrendered it unto the Meir Jumlah, uppon composition for himselfe and all his people to goe away free; but how hee will be received by the King we shall advise you by the next, for this newes came unto us but yesterday.'

'In the Dutch document already quoted this fort is called "Oudegiere" (Udayagiri ?). Its situation is not known. (It is Udayagiri in the Nellore Dt., always known one of the strongest of Vijayanagar Forts and the stronghold of the Eastern Viceroyalty.) It could hardly be the place of that name in Nellore District, as this would be too far north.'

(E. P. 25, January 21, 1646, and note 1; p. 26, February, 10,1646 and note 2, *The English Factories in India, 1646-50*).

† 'Then comes a long silence, but from the Dutch records we learn that Śrīranga, after suffering a severe defeat under the walls of Vellore, was forced to pay a heavy indemnity to the leader of the Bijapur army, and that the Nāyaks, sobered by the successes of the Muhammadans, returned to their allegiance, and promised to assist the King in maintaining the independence of his country. The siege of Pulicat ceased with the fall of Malaya from power; and in May a fresh lease of the town and district was obtained from Śrīranga.'

(*The English Factories in India 1646-50*, p. xxv.)

Jumla, in consequence, oonquered all the districts and was within two days' march of Madras on his way to Ginjee.*

There is a note in October 1647 that the Company obtained a renewal of the grant from Mīr Jumla and that the Rāyalu had fled the country.†

---

* The warres and fammine doth still furiously rage in these parts, and wee thinke that there wilbe a period sett unto the former before the latter: for the Anna Bobb (1) Meir Jumlah hath taken the government of Pullicatte and St. Thome, settinge the country all in order as hee goeth along, and is now within two dayes martch of the Kings court and noe body commeth to oppose him, the fammine havinge almost destroyed all the kingdome; for out of our little towne there hath dyed noe less than 3,000 people since September last; in Pullicatte as report saith, 15,000: and in St. Thome no less.

(*The English Factories in India, 1646–50* (January), p. 70.)

† 'Wee had almost forgotten to advise you that the 16,000 rials of eight President Baker left us indebted at the coast at his goinge to Bantam was lent us by the King of Gulcondah(s) Generall, who hath almost conquer'd this kingdome and reigneth as King under the title of Annabob (see p. 70). This 16,000 rials hee lent us for one twelve months gratis; which debt wee discharged at the arrivall of the *Farewell*. So, in requitall of the Annabobs curtezie, wee gave him one of the two brass guns you sent out by the *Mary*, which hee would not bee denied of, whither hee had lent us this money or no; otherwise he would not have confirmed our old privilidges formerlye graunted us by the now fledd Jentue King. So upon the deliveringe of this gunn hee gave it us here under his hand that hee received the gunn in full and contentable sattisfaction for the loan of 16,000 rials of eight to the Company the whole space of one twelve month, and never hereafter would desire any thing elce for the same; and withall confirm'd under the King of Gulcondah(s) great seale all our former privilidges in ample manner, as it was graunted unto us by the aforesaid fledd Jentue

1. Al-Nawab.

Mir Jumla marched upon Gingee, having strengthened himself by an alliance with Bijapur. In front of the walls of Ginjee, the Bijapur contingent went over to the side of Golkoṇḍa, and Golkoṇḍa allowed the Bijapur troops to occupy Ginjee. The Bijapur army assumed possession of Ginjee and Tegnapatam near Cuddalore. It was then that the Rāja of Karnāṭak, that is, ŚrIranga, found his position untenable and fled to Mysore, which was then at war with Bijapur.*

King. Soe by this means the gun hath saved you three tymes the vallue of it, by accomplishing too good acts at once.'

A letter he carried declared that food was dear and cotton goods were difficult to obtain, as the country was being harried by fresh incursions of the Golkoṇḍa and Bijapur armies, with the result that Porto Novo and Pondicherri were 'in a manner ruin'd,' while Tegnapatam, the other chief centre of the piece-goods trade in that region, had to buy immunity from a like fate by continueall presents.'

(*The English Factories in India, 1646–50*, pp. 166–7, October 9, 1647, and also Letter by *Ivy* to Bantam same vol. p. xxx August 19, 1648).

* 'On the eastern side of India, at the beginning of the period under review, the Carnatic was still being harassed by the incursions of its Muhammadan foes, and by their constant dissensions and conflicts. The forces of the King of Bijapur had conquered the whole of the district centring in the famous fortress of Ginjee, including the seaboard round Tegnapatam, of which Malaya was made Governor; and the Dutch promptly took advantage of this to obtain (August, 1651) a grant of trade at that and the neighbouring ports (*Hague Transcripts*, series i, vol. xvii, No. 532; vol. xviii, No. 539). The unhappy Rāja of the Carnatic had taken refuge with the Nāyak of Mysore, who was at war with Bijapur (*Ibid*, vol. xvii, No. 518). Meanwhile, to the northwards, the Nawab Mir Jumla, as general of the Golkoṇḍa forces, was busy consolidating his position.'

(*The English Factories in India 1651–54*, pp. xxiv-xxv.)

It was about this time that the activities of Mir Jumla brought him into hostilities with Bijapur, and war broke out soon after the fall of Ginjee, possibly in the year 1651.*

The contest between the two lasted for some time and ultimately Mir Jumla was able to enter into a treaty with Bijapur, paying six hundred thousand pagodas for the retention of his conquests made in the territories of Śrīranga.†

The war was apparently waged for the division of the spoil. Bijapur, in her turn, now became very active, marched across and captured Penukoṇḍa and wanted

---

*' Warrs being commenced between the Moores of Gulcondah and Vizapore, who, haveing shared this afflicted kingdome, are now bandying against each other, whilst the poore Jentue, hopeing their mutuall destruction, watches oppertunity to breake of his present miserable yoke. In the interim many bickerings have bin within two daies journey of this place, and tis reported that the Nabob with his whole armey is besieged among the hills of Gulcondah, whither hee retired for the more safty, by the Vizaporias: which hath soe distracted this country that wee could not adventure your monies abroad without to much hazard.'

(*The English Factories in India, 1651-54*, p. 99, January 14, 1652).

†' Have already advised the troubles 'ariseing from the quarrel, betweene the Vizapore and Golcandah Moores; but lately peace is concluded betweene the two Kings, being bought by the last for 600,000 (some say 900,000) pagodas; for which sume hee is againe restore'd to possession of his late conquests, part whereof had in this bickering beene surprized by the Vizaporeans, whose King for these many months was reported dead, though now resuscitated and said to bee in better health then for diverse passed yeares.'

(*The English Factories in India, 1651-54*, p. 111, January 27, 1652.)

permission to march on to Ginjee through the territory belonging to Mir Jumla. Mir Jumla declined to grant them free passage through his territory and sought the assistance of Mysore, and made direct overtures to the emperor Śrīranga. This was in 1652. The Bijapur army marched up to Vellore, took possession of it, and left the emperor with Chandragiri for his capital and a few districts dependent thereon. This was soon after March A.D. 1653.*

Soon after followed the attempt of Mir Jumla at independence, which Abdullah Quṭub Shah had long suspected. His efforts to bring his powerful lieutenant to heel threw him first into the hands of Bijapur and then into the

---

*'The war in the Carnatic was continued as strenuously as ever. According to the Dutch records, the Bijaur commander-in-chief having mastered the important fortress of Penukoṇḍa in March, 1653, thereupon requested permission to pass through the districts held by the Golkoṇḍa troops on his way to Ginjee; but this was refused by Mir Jumla, who, alarmed at the success of the Bijapur troops, was animating the Nāyak of Mysore against them and also making overtures to the Carnatic Rāja. The latter, relying on Mir Jumla's promises, returned to Vellore and raised a large army, hoping to drive the Bijapuris out of the country (*Hague Transcripts*, series i, vol. xix, No. 550 (i)). The issue of all this is told in a letter from Batavia of November 7, 1654 (N.S.), which states that the Bijapur general had, after a long siege, captured Vellore and concluded a treaty with the Rāja, by which Chandragiri was left to the latter, with the revenues of certain districts (*Ibid.*, No. 551). Meanwhile the Dutch were endeavouring to live as peaceably as possible with both contending powers. This was not easy in the case of Mir Jumla, who (as we have seen) was much irritsted by their refusal to grant passes to Indian ships desirous of trading with Ceylon, Achin, and all districts in which the Dutch were striving te establish a monopoly.'

(*The English Factories in India, 1651-54*, p. xxxiii.)

hands of the Mughal Prince, Aurangzeb, actively operating in behalf of his father in the Dakhan at the time.*

---

*'It is interesting to note that the Dutch at this time were negotiating with the Danes for the purchase of Tranquebar, mainly in order to prevent its falling into the hands of the Portuguese or the English. The Danes, however, though in a somewhat critical position, decided to hold out in hope of relief from Europe, though they promised to give the Dutch the first offer, should they be compelled to give up their settlement.'

'In September 1654, the English factors reported a fresh development in the unstable politics of the Coast. The King of Golkoṇḍa, Abdullah Quṭub Shah, had long been jealous of the power wielded by his servant, Mir Jumla, and an open breach had now occurred between them. (p. 290). The latter was suspected of an intention of making himself an independent sovereign of the territory he had conquered in the Carnatic; but he was well aware of the difficulty of standing alone, and after making overtures to the King of Bijapur, he finally succumbed to the intrigues of Aurangzeb, who, as Viceroy of the Deccan, was eagerly watching for an opportunity to interfere. Mir Jumla agreed to enter the service of the Mughal Emperor; but rumours of his intention so alarmed Abdullah Kuṭub Shah that he sought to win back the friendship of his former minister, and the latter hesitated until the imprisonment of his family at Golkoṇḍa towards the end of 1655—an act provoked by the haughty behaviour of his son—precipitated the crisis and drove Mir Jumla into the arms of Aurangzeb with disastrous results to the Golkoṇḍa kingdom.'

'It hath been no small miserye that this poore heathen country hath suffered any tyme these ten years almost, since the Moores of Vizapore on one side and those of Gulcondah on the other side first made inroads upon it. And now, when wee hoped all would have beene put in some good posture of government, to continue still those miseries (or rather to adde a greater burthen to it) our Nabob is lately up in armes against the King of Gulcondah his master, whose commands he slighteth, intending (soe farre as is conceived) to keepe what part of the country hee hath conquered to himselfe; which

Mīr Jumla got confirmation of his possession of the Karnāṭak from Shah Jahan, and continued his trading activities in the region up to July 1656.*

In November 1656, Śrīranga had recovered a good deal and was laying siege to Pulicat as against Mir Jumla.†

---

if hee can accomplish, hee will soone bee as great a king as his yearly revenew little inferrour to it. What the issue to those things wilbe, the Almighty only knoweth; in the meane tyme wee that live here amongst them shalbee sure never to want troubles on every side.'

In the booke (1) of transactions with the Nabob (you will) read how hee hath intrenched on our privileges (in Madras)—patam; which was begunn by the Braminess me(ntioned in Mr.) Bakers tyme who would take no notice of their (actions, but) supported them . . . In the meane tyme weele str(ive to keep what) wee have, until better tymes. The said Nabob is (in opposition) to the King his master; nor can wee divine the i(ssue of this un) certaine ware from such varrious reports as pass in (these parts; but) suppose, if the King oremaster him, heele fly to the (Mogull for) shelter, who already begins to take his part.'

(*The English Factories in India, 1650–55*, p. xxxiv, also p. 290, September 18, 1654; and p. 46, February 4, 1656, *ibid.* vol. for 1655–60.)

* 'The report runs that this King will send an army against Golcunda and Decan (i.e. Bijapur) in favour of Miere Jimla, lately generall of the King of Gulcondah(s) forces, who haveing subdued the large territory of Ram Rajah, (1) is reported now to bee in rebellion, proffering Sha Jehan to doe his best to subject the whole country of Gulcondah to his more absolute command. If this warr goe forwards, it may perhaps bee as dangerous to send the saltpeeter by the way of Brampore (Burhanpur) as Ahmedabad, for if the prince Oran Zaeb have occasion for any, noe doubt but hee will stop it, and then it may bee a business very troublesome to gett mony for it.'

(*The English Factories in India, 1655–60*, pp. 62–3, February 6, 1656.)

† 'This long imprisoned King at last returned to his city, after (by reporte) the receipt of good news from the Mogull, who they say

According to the Dutch records of January 1657, Koneri Chetti who was entrusted with the operations in

---

keepes the Nabob by him and will not permit him to returne to these countreys againe, and hath given him all the Curnatt (Carnatic) country to his disposall and yeares tribitt free. This is reported for truth; whither soe or noe, (I) knowe not. But for certaine hee (i.e. Mir Jumla) hath lately sent an army of neare 10,000 horse to take possession of Curnatt, and at his comeing into the city had not lesse then 50,000 horse and foote, richly acoutred, which are all in pay, that marched before him.'

'The story regarding the disposal of the Carnatic was, in effect, true. Abdullah Kuṭub Shah had done his best to retain that rich province, which had been conquered on his behalf by the Nawab; but Shah Jahan decided that it must be treated as Mir Jumla's *jāgīr*, held directly from the Emperor, and the Golkoṇḍa monarch was ordered to recall his officers from the province.(1) As a Madras letter of July 7, 1656 (written, it is true, before the decision was known there), says:

'As for this countrey about us, tis indifferent quiett; continueing yett under the Nabobs government, whose officers still remaine in theire places of command, though the army bee much lessned by his departure.'

'In which respect wee have not as yett broake their seales, but deferre their opening until wee bee better informed to whome they belong, or the countrey settled in the Gentue Kings possession, which would not only secure us from future trouble but much advance your affaires in these parts, for some good service wee have done him in assisting Conar Cittee (Koneri Chetti), his generall for these quarters; which business, if the success be sutable to the beginning, this place will bee better worth your owning then ever.'

'Alsœ it was reported that the king of Gulcondah had left the countrey of Carnaticum again to the Roylæs; uppon which the Kinge of the Jentues father-in-law, called Vengum Rajah, with a partye of

1. 'See Professor Sarkar's Aurangzeb, Vol. i, p. 245.

behalf of Śrīranga betrayed him and made overtures to Tupākki Krishṇappa, Mir Jumla's lieutenant.*

souldiers tooke parte of the country, and came to Peddapollium ;(1) which newes when Sidelee heard, not raising siege nor comeing hither returned to Pullecatt.

'And all the countrey hereabouts (Punnamalee castle excepted) rendered to the Jentue Kings obedience, who, now, in the Nabobs absence, is up in arms for the recovering of his kingdome, and hath already recovered a large part.'

'Nor are our Dutch neighbours in Pullecatt altogether secure, for all their strength, should the Gentue King overcome, who yet is able to counterpoize the Nabobs party and may happily get the day at last, if the Nabob come not in person to conserve his conquest; which is much to bee doubted, though his party report that hee is on the way from Agra as farre as Brampore with a formidable army; but tis supposed Vizapore (Bijapur) will take him up by the way. As for Conar Cittee, hee rendered himself up to the Moores as a prisoner, but was received in state by the commanders with more then accustomed honour in such cases; which, considered with his alliance, and neere relation to Topa Kistnapa, the Nabobs generall togither with other circumstances, and observations in his present deport and continued respect from ditto Kistnapa, are sufficient to ground the generall suspicion of his betraying the kings army.'

(*The English Factories in India, 1655-60*, pp. 91, 94, 95, 97 and 98.)

* 'And all the countrey hereabouts (Punnamalee castle excepted) rendered to the Jentue King's obedience, who now, in the Nabobs absence, is up in armes for the recovering of his kingdome, and hath already recovered a large part.

'Next from a letter sent by the Madras factors to Bantam, dated, November, 5, we learn that—

'All these countries that were formerly conquered by the Nabob are now of late (in his absence at the Moghulls court) upon the revolt,

1. Possibly Peddanaikpetta (a ward of Madras) is meant.

This latter is said to have inflicted a defeat upon

the Jentue King with diverse Nagues being in arms; some of whose forces are now at the seidge of Paleacatt, where tis said most of the Nabobs riches are stowed. Here is nothing but takeing and retakeing of places, with parties of both sides, in all places; soe that tis very dangerous giving out monies for goods in these tymes. But wee hope ere long 'twill be settled, especially for us, if the King recovers his countrey.'

'And finally we have the report made to the Company by Greenhill and Chamber on January 28, 1657.

'The warres in these parts have been an exeeding hinderance to the progress of your business in this place; and the more through the treachery of Conarcity, whom the Jentue King made his generall in these parts about Punnomalee; which castle might have been easily brought in subjection, but hee delayed the time until the Nabobs party had united their forces and formed a body to overpower him; whereupon hee basely fledd to this towne with his army.'

'Nor are our Dutch neighbours in Pullecatt altogether secure, for all their strength, should the Gentue King overcome, who yet is able to counterpoize the Nabobs party and may happily get the day at last, if the Nabob come not in person to conserve his conquest; which is much to bee doubted, though his party report that hee is on the way from Agra as farre as Brahmpore with a formidable army; but tis supposed Vizapore (Bijapur) will take him up by the way. As for Conarcittee, he rendered himselfe up to the Moores as a prisoner, but was received in state by the comanders with more than accustomed honour in such cases; which, considered with his alliance and neere relation to Topa Kistnapa, the Nabobs generall, togither with other circumstances and observations in his present deport and continued respect from ditto Kistnapa, are sufficient to ground the generall suspicion of his betraying the king's army.'

'A letter from Batavia, written towards the end of January, 1657 (*Hague Transcripts*. series. i, vol. xxi, No. 612), gives some additional particulars. It says that the Chandragiri Rāja with an army of 8,000 men captured the pagoda of Tirupati, and then designed the conquest

Śrīranga in September of that year.*

---

of the districts of Conjeeveram, Chingleput, 'Carmigaelpatam', and Pulicat. He wrote secretly to the Dutch chief at the last-named place, asking him to secure for him the Nawab's treasure (which had presumably been hurried thither for safety), or at least to prevent its being carried away by sea. Reply was made that the Dutch had no jurisdiction in the town of Pulicat, which was guarded by the Nawab's troops. The Rāja then besought the Dutch to remain neutral in the event of his attacking the place; but to this they answered that they were under a contract with the Nawab to assist him in such a case.'

(*The English Factories in India, 1655–60*, pp. 97, 98 and 99.)

* 'Since when the nuse heare touching the Nabobs proceeding in Decan differs littell from your relationes, only the takeing of Colburge,(1) reported by that party, is contradicted; but tis said he is now at the siege of another strong place, called Callinarra (Kalyani), where many bloody conflicts hath passed on both sides, which hath much retarded the expectation of his speedy conquest, and detained him from succoring his party in these quarters; who were lately so invironed by the Gentues that they could not have long subsisted, had not the generall, Topa Kistnapa, and old souldier, layed an ambuscada for a greate party of the Kings horse that hath bene plundering, and returning confidently (or rather carelesly) fell thereinto; where though they lost not 100 men killed, yet fled so amazedley that they put all the company in such a feare as most of them disbanded and fled, leaving the King and (his?) adjutant Shangee (Shanji) only with 1,000 horse (and) foote? who stade behind two dayes and then retreated two miles to Arni, a strong castell on the borders of Chinge (Ginji); whar they are recruiteing the army with the Vizaporians (i e. Bijapurs') assistance and intended er long to be in the field with greater force then before. In the meane time Topa Kisna strengthens himselfe by all possible menes and leikurely (leisurely?) follows them, to see if he can get another advantage before

1. (Kulbarga or Gulbarga, now in the Hyderabad State, about seventy-five miles north-east of Bijapur. It does not seem to have been attacked in this campaign, the course of which has been described on p. 118.)

This brought about the siege of Madras in behalf of Mir Jumla.*

Now that Mir Jumla was in Agra, Golkoṇḍa began to take a strong line to assert its claims to what had become Mir Jumla's territory. In August 1658, there was fighting between Tupākki Krishṇappa and the Golkoṇḍa forces round Poonamallee. Tupākki Krishṇappa came to terms with Fort St. George in order to be free for this.†

---

thare whole powers be united. This unexpected defeate was about forty miles from this place; which is now so well provided as (we) do dot much feare the worst (that) can happen, especially (as) our cause is soe just.

(*The English Factories in India, 1655–60*, pp. 135-6.)

* See * note on p. 397.

† 'We for our parts hitherto enjoy all freedome and quietnesse though the noyse of warre and thundering of ordinance are day and night within our hearing. The castle of Pulomolee, about ten miles off, having revolted to the King of Gulcondah, is beleagred by Topa Kisna's forces, that formerly besieged us and Pulicatt; to whom it had been rendered ere this time, but that they expect help from the Gulcondah forces, which are said to be marching this wayes. So as you may easily gusse at the misery these countryes suffer, being covered with many severall armyes, and is very destructive to the trade thereof and consequently to our present affaires; so as we are forced for the most part to fetch our goods thirty leagues on each side from this place.'

(*The English Factories in India, 1655–60*, p. 176.)

'From the Dutch records we learn that in October Kuli Beg, commanding the Golkoṇḍa forces, inflicted a serious defeat on Tupākki Krishṇappa, who was wounded and taken prisoner. The victor subdued all the district round Madras, and the Dutch at Pulicat found themselves obliged to come to terms with him, while San Thome also submitted (*Hague Transcripts*, series i, vol. xxiii, No. 639).'

In the December of that year, Mir Jumla's son Tapa Tapa demands the restoration of Mir Jumla's Junk.*

In December 1659, Revington writing from Dandarajapur on the West Coast refers to Rustum-i-zamān as a friend of Shahji and Shivaji, and among the Umras who declined to recognize Ibrahim Ādil Shah's succession are mentioned Rustam-i-zamān, Bahlol Khan, Shahji and Shivaji, as though all the four of them were Amīrs of similar rank.†

---

* 'Tapa Tapa came to this towne with Orange Zebes firmaund, demaunding of Mr. Winter the Nabobs juncke; which he denying, secondarily required her of us, as also the Persia(n) comonly called Cajee (Kaji), who Mr. Winter conveyed to your port, to whome the Nabob, upon his leaveing Carnatt, left him Cheife Salaskaree (*sar-lashkar*, head of the troops) in those parts, on whome is pretended very large somes to be in his hands of the Nabobs; of whome, as well as the juncke, if there be not a surrender made, the Company, as well as their servants, are like to be sufferers in these parts.

(*The English Factories in India, 1655-60*, p. 187, December 22, 1658.)

Bernier (1670 ed., Vol. ii, p. 180) says that Mir Jumla's son had so much influence at Masulipatam that "le tap-tapa, son commis, en est quasi le maistre". He seems thus to use "Taptapa" as a title; but, as Sir Charles Lyall hos pointed out to me, it is really a personal name, Tapa Tapa, implying descent from the great-grandson of Ali of that designation. In the Dutch Records at the India Office (*Hague Transcripts*, series i, vol. xxiii, No. 651) he is called "Miermameth Hosseyn Taffa Tappa."'

† 'The person that is cald King of this country is knowne to be, the bastard of this Queenes husband (1) and she notwithstanding that

1 'The question of the legitimacy of Ali Adil Shah II is examined by Professor Jadunath Sarkar at p. 285 of the first volume of his History of Aurangzeb. He accepts Grant Duff's view that the boy was really the son of the late king, and suggests that his mother was a slave-girl in the harem. Bernier and Tavernier say that he was simply an adopted son, and Aurangzeb made the same assertion as an excuse for his invasion of Bijapur, Manucci and Fryer stigmatize him as an illegitimate son of the Queen herself.'

It is also stated in the course of the letter that Shahjī was expected to march up from his government extending to Ginjee with 17,000 troops in a month and overthrow the government of Ālī Ādil Shah who could put into the field only 10,000.*

---

would have the crowne setled on him; but some of the Umbrawes of this country, knowing to bee spuriously begotten, will not give him homadge and refuses to gœ to court; and these are Rustum Jemah, Bull Ckaune,(1) Shawgee (Shahji Bhonsla), and Sevagy; which latter lyes with an army to the no(rth) ward and commands all alongst the cost from the upper Choul (2) unto Dabull; against whom the Queene this yeare sent Abdle Ckaune (3) with an army of 10,000 hors eand foote; and because shee knew with that strength hee was not able to resist Sevagy, shee councelld him to pretend friendshipp with his enemy; which hee did.'

(*The English Factories in India, 1655–60*, pp. 249–50.)

* 'One months tyme more will, wee beleive; put an end to this trouble; for Sevagyes father, Shawjee, that lyes to the southward, is expected within eight dayes with his army, consisting of 17,000 men, and then thay intend for Vizapore (Bijapur), the King and Queenes residence, whose streng(t)h consists onely in men, and they are not above 10,000 souldyers; so that in all probability the kingdome will bee lost; and if it proves so, all that Rustum Jemah hath promised us, of a tancksall, or remitting you part of the saltpeeter costomes, and of assisting you in taking Danda Rajapore Castle, which are three things wee dœ desire to bee instrumentall in, will as certainley bee performed. Wee onely want power and means, and a good head at Suratt.

(*The English Factories in India, 1655–60*, p. 251.)

1. 'The general Bahlol Khan. Fryer calls him "Bullul Caun".' See also Grant Duff's *History of the Mahrattas*, Vol. i, p. 256.

2. Chaul (near Alibag, in Kolaba District) is divided into Upper and Lower Chaul, the latter (also called Revadanda) being the Portuguese settlement.

3. 'Afzal Khan. Fryer speaks of him as "Abdul Caun." The name appears to have been Abdullah, "Afzal Khan" (the pre-eminent lord) being merely a title.'

In a letter, dated October 1661, Shahji is referred to as the Bijapur general and his having taken Porto Novo from the English is stated in clear terms.*

Shahji's imprisonment and the treaty between Shivaji and Bijapur are under reference in a letter dated January 1663.†

---

* 'If this bee indured by these governours, they will presume further; and wee have the like complaint to present concerning Xaigee(1) (whœ is father to him that is the Visapore (Bijapur) generall and hath Mr. Revington in durance); for hee came in July last to Porta Nova and robbed and pillaged the towne; whereof the Companies merchants were the greatest loosers, having taken from in ellephants, callicœs, broad cloth, copper, benjamen (benzoin), etc., goodes to the value of 30,000 pardawes, and are utterly unable to pay the Company their remaynes in their hands, being about 4,000 pa(godas), unless our masters will licence us to vindicate them by their shipping at sea, for this Xaigee hath now Porta Nova in possession.'

† 'By the mediation of Shahji Bhonsla (his father), Sivaji had come to terms with his nominal overlord, the King of Bijapur, with the result that Bijapur, amongst other districts, had been recognized as part of his territories.(2)

1. 'Shahji, the father of Sivaji. His depredations in the Carnatic, nominally on behalf of the King of Bijapur, have been alluded to in the preceding volume.

'It was declared that there was now no reason for ships to call at Porto Novo, since' the towne is wholly destroyed and the merchants totally ruined by Xagee, the Visapore King's Generall.'

(*The English Factories in India, 1661-64*, p 50, October 19, 1661; also p. 51.)

2. "The Bijapur Government granted all Shivaji's demands (A.D. 1662). He was left in possession of his conquests from Kalyan in the north to Phonda in the south and from Dabhol in the west to Indapur in the east, and his complete independence was akcnowledged. Both parties undertook to defend the other from foreign aggression. And Shivaji took a solemn oath not to molest Bijapur during Shahji's lifetime." (*A History of the Mahratta people*, by Kincaid and Parasnis Vol. i, p. 175.)

In letters, dated the 19th and 20th July 1663, Shahjī's position of influence with Bijapur is referred to. Bahlol Khan was summoned to court, but would not go unless Shahji accompanied him. There is also a reference to a Bijapur invasion against Snep-Nāyak (obviously standing for Sivappa Nāyaka of Ikkēri), the Karnāṭak Rāja, and his being forced to 'a composition of 7,000,000 pagodas.'*

'But he told us what past must be forgotten, and that for the future never any such thing should happen again, nor should wee ever suffer by his master to the value of a corn of rice loose; giving in severall reasons for what had happened......as, his master then having warr with the King of Deccan (which since is ended and they now certainly at amity), and therefore he robd his countrey. as allso the great necessity that then were upon him, occasioned by his warring with two potent Kings and Oran Shaw having spoiled him of great parts of his dominions, etc, but now his master had no such great necessity depending; but although any such should happen again, yet he now was fully resolved never hereafter to commit the like outrages as formerly and would give us his invoilable oath wee should never be any wayes injured againe; shewing us with all a writing from his master with his own chop (i.e., seal) and others accustomary to it; allso the print of the Rajah's hand on the top of the paper, done with sandall, declaring his resolve to tend as permentioned. To all which wee answered that, in confidence of the truth of what he had alleged, wee did believe our masters would be perswaded to trade againe to these ports, that are now in the Rajah's possession, provided reparation be made to their former losses; which wee hoped would be done, and assured him his master would not be a losser thereby.'

(*The English Factories in India, 1661–64*, p. 230 and note, and p. 231.)

* 'Rustum Jeamah, returning from whence the King had placed him to Hookery, his owne towne, by the Kings order is denied entrance. This jessud sweares before he came out of Bunckapore, he

In the accounts so far given there is no reference to Shahji in our sources relating to the history of Mysore. There is clear reference to Shahji in the Company's records from the year 1657 onwards, that is, more or less after the disappearance of Mīr Jumla from the scene of his activities in the Golkoṇḍa Karnāṭak. One may therefore fain argue that Shahji was playing but a very subordinate part all

---

saw irons put on Bussall Ckan([1]) and Shagee (Shahji) (Shevgys father), but taken off of the latter in two dayes; who is now with the King without any command. Bussall Ckans mother denying the King entrance into Bunckapore, the King wrote to Shagee to perswade Bussall Ckan to come and stand to his mercy, for the King, being denied entrance, was so incenced that, if he stood out any longer, would never have pardoned him, and now he could not hope to be able to withstand him, the kingdome being at peace since the King conquered Snep-Nayck, a Carnattic Rajah, and brought him to a composition of 7,000,000 pagodas.([2]) The rebelling of this Rajah was the cause of the Kings going for Bunckapore. At last Shagee perswaded Bussall Ckan to goe to the King, upon condition that he would accompany him; which he did, and so the King trapann'd them both. The King hath likewise wrote Syddy Mussad (Sidi Mas'ud), Syddy Zoars sonne in law, and to Syddy Zoars eldest sonne ([3]) (the former of which hath 14,000 horse, the latter 10,000) to come to him; but they returne him answer that they dare not trust him that had murdered their father; ([4]) upon which the King wrote them againe, that they had no reason to mistrust him, he having now imprisoned Bussall Ckan, who was the only cause of their fathers death.'

1. 'An error for Bahlol Khan.

2. The Batavia Dagh-Register, 1664 (p. 323) says 1,500,000.

3. Sidi Aziz.

4. For the murder of Sidi Johar, see Grant Duff (ed. Edwardes), Vol. i. p. 146.

(*The English Factories in India, 1661–64*, pp. 242–3.)

through, although the position that he is said in the Company's records, to have occupied after A.D. 1657 would give the clearest possible indication that he must have been occupying a position of some importance before that.

In this connection we shall have to consider the new light that is brought to bear upon the subject by Sir Jadunath Sarkar in the *Modern Review* for July 1929. Sir Jadunath claims to have acquired two manuscripts relating to the reigns of the Bījapur Sultans, Muhammad Ādil Shah (A.D. 1627–56) and Āli Ādil Shah A.D. 1627-72). These are described by him as contemporary official histories, the first by Ẓahūr bin Ẓahūri and the second by Nūrullāh. He also notes that these two sources were not available to the author of the *Basātinu's-salāṭīn* written in 1824, and which 'hitherto was our source of information for Bijapur history.' 'In the light of *these first-rate materials* and the annual Jesuit letters from Madura, it is now possible to trace step by step and in clear detail the story of *how the Muhammadans seized the heritage of the recently shattered empire of Vijayanagar* and crushed its numberless, disunited, mutually jealous and warring Hindu feudatories, across the entire Indian peninsula from Goa to Madras. The Ādil Shah of Bijapur conquered what are called in his Persian history "Malnāḍ and Karnāṭak" i.e. first the Kanara country of Bednur, then Mysore, starting from the Ikkēri or Nagar district in the west, on to Sira and Bangalore in the centre and the north Salem district in the south east corner, and finally descending the Eastern Ghats the Madras plains up to Vellore, Ginjee and Waligandapuram within sight of Tanjore.

The Quṭub Shah of Golkoṇḍa seized the Hindu principalities due south and south-east of his capital, i.e. the country beyond the Krishna, lying north-east of these new Bljapur acquisitions.'

'Between these two streams of invasion, Śrīranga Rāyal, the last representative of Vijayanagar royalty, was completely crushed out. He offered a long and desperate resistance. But his worst enemies were his own people. The insane pride, blind selfishness, disloyalty and mutual dissensions of his Hindu feudatories rendered all his efforts futile and the Muslims conquered Hindu Deccan piecemeal *with the greatest ease and rapidity.* As the Jesuit missionary Antoine de Proenza wrote from Trichinopoly (1659): "The old kings of this country appear, by their jealousies and imprudent action, to invite the conquest of entire India by the Muslims"' (*Mission de Madure*, iii. 42.)

Before proceeding to exhibit his material, Professor Sarkar, indulges in comparison of the overthrow of the Hindu kingdoms, of the south and the Muslim conquests of Hindustan, and draws the conclusion that in the course of the years 1637–64 *the extinction of Hindu rule in the south was brought about*, and this period corresponds exactly to the life of Shahji as a servant of Bijapur. He lays himself out to indicate that 'the popular Maratha tradition that he was the leading general or conqueror of Mysore finds a complete refutation in the *authentic historical sources described above.* These sources prove that Shahji was not the supreme army chief, *nor even the commander of an independent division*, but only one of the many Bijapuri generals *serving under the eyes and orders of the Muslim*

generalissimo, throughout the conquest of Mysore; *and it was only very late in his life*, in the invasion of Tanjore in 1660–62 (which was, however, followed not by an annexation, but by withdrawal), that *he rose to be second in command*.' Then he proceeds to state categorically under six heads the invasions of this country and the results achieved by these invasions.

The campaigns of the years 1638–39 ended in the capture of all the territory up to Bangalore according to this account. Shahji was placed in the fortress of Bangalore to carry on the government of the conquered parts. Rustam-i-zamān himself proceeded to lay siege to Srirangapatam, which under Kanṭhīrava Narasa Rāja Woḍēyār, according to this account, submitted after a month's fight, paying five lakhs of gold pieces. The learned historian next proceeds to state 'when Rustam-i-zamān returned from Mysore at the approach of the rainy season, Kengē Nāyaka rebelled, and there was a general rising of the Hindu Rājas throughout the Kanarese country against Bijapur. So, the war was renewed, Rustum-i-zamān returned, and Basavapaṭna, belonging to Kengē Nāyaka, was taken after an elaborate siege, in which Shahji played a part with Afzal Khan and other generals. While Rustam stayed in Basavapaṭana, Afzal Khan was ordered forward. He took Chik-Nāyakan-halli and Bellūr belonging to Venkaṭapati, and Tāmkūr. Rustam is next stated to have taken possession of Balapur (Ballapūr) and Kulihal (Kuṇigal). That closes section I.

So in this official account, no cause is given for the war, and the Bijapur invasion is begun as if it came upon

Mysore like a bolt from the blue. Historical events did not take place in that fashion, even where the Sultans of Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa were concerned. The Hindu accounts give it that the intervention of Bijapur was sought, and the invasion was launched accordingly; nor can this court account be regarded as thoroughly historical. It was not such a beautifully unopposed march down to the walls of Ginjee, nor so satisfactory a settlement. The fatal weakness of the account is that it gives no explanation of the part that Kengē Nāyaka, as he is called, played. He figures in the second campaign, without any mention of his name in the first. It is he who was the author of all the mischief; and the person concerned was not Kengē Nāyaka, but Kengē Hanuma, the son of Kengē Nāyaka. He invited the Bajapur army and brought about Bijapur intervention. The renewal of the Bijapur invasion again was caused, according to the Hindu accounts, because Kengē Hanuma, who was placed in charge of the territory on the northern bank of the Kāvēri, as against Kanṭhīrava Narasa holding the territory, south of the Kāvēri, played false and brought on the invasion, this time perhaps by the incitement of Nāgamangala Channayya, who had to go from his territory to Bijapur as a combined result of Mysore expansion and Hanuma's administration. The treaty that Kanṭhīrava Narasa entered into was only to gain time, so that Srirangapatam might be fortified and put in a position to withstand a siege. In this campaign, Shahji is stated by this court historian to have been placed in the fort of Bangalore, and to have been charged with the administration and garrisoning of the district dependent on it, which would perhaps constitute a somewhat important

position, subordinate, of course, to that of the commander-in-chief Ranadhoola Khan, as he is called in Hindu histories, sometimes also described as Khan-i-Zamān.

The next section, division IV of Sir Jadunath's article, simply says that the war was renewed in A.D. 1644. No reson for this renewal of the war seems called for so far, at any rate, as Sir Jadunath is concerned. The fort of Tikri, as it is called, is supposed to have been taken, and Śivappa Nāyaka is stated to have wrested it from the Bijapur commander. The fort was not Tikri, but Ikkēri, the capital of the Nāyaks of Beḍnūr. The next commander who was despatched, Khan Muhammad, is said to have taken both Tikri and Sāgar, four miles from it. The names ought to be Ikkēri and Sāgar, which latter is actually situated between Ikkēri and Keḷadi, the two capitals of the Nāyaks of the place. The following year Khan Muhammad is supposed to have marched into the Karnāṭak and gained a succession of victories, until, in A.D. 1646. he is said to have captured Nandyal and eight other forts in the Kurnool district. It is pointed out that in this campaign Shahji played no part, and did not deserve to be 'mentioned' in the despatches. The campaign, beginning in 1644 and ending in 1646, is described as a mere rhodomontade by this official historian. Apart from what we find in the Hindu accounts, we see in the Company's records that a great change was taking place. Early in the year 1643, the chief Governor of the Vijayanagar empire, Dāmarla Venkaṭa, was found intriguing with the Wazīr of Golkoṇḍa, Mir Jumla. He was promptly placed under arrest. His influential brother Ayyappa was raising forces against the emperor Śrīranga

with a view to compel him to release Venkaṭa. In the course of the year 1643, Śrīranga obtained the assistance of Bijapur, and Bijapur undertook an invasion to assist him for a consideration of 15 lakhs of gold pieces and twenty-four elephants. The campaign of 1644 began as a result of this agreement between the Vijayanagar emperor Śrīranga and the Bijapur Sultan, and naturally, therefore, the sphere of the campaign would extend to the region indicated in the official account. It shows the Bijapur activity not only in the Shimoga district, but along the whole frontier eastwards into the Kurnool district, undoubtedly the territory of Golkoṇḍa, under Mir Jumla's actual administration. This would be inexplicable, notwithstanding the first-rate importance of the court historian, unless it was a war undertaken by Bijapur against Golkoṇḍa as well. Golkoṇḍa's intervention was naturally sought by Venkaṭa's brother Ayyappa. In 1644 under pressure of this joint effort, Śrīranga was compelled to restore Dāmarla Venkaṭa to his freedom, but apparently not to his former position, Mallaiya taking his place. Mallaiya, in his turn, captured Dutch goods and pressed them hard at Pulicat, but fell into disgrace by surrendering Udayagiri to Mir Jumla. It was during this period of the restoration of Śrīranga that the East India Company's factors in Madras obtained a renewal of the grant from him.

The next campaign, according to this account is that of 1646, when the Prime Minister of Bijapur, Mustafa Khan led the expedition. He is taken again in glorious career across the whole territory. But unfortunately the details given of the campaign give the lie direct to this glorious

success. Āsaf Khan and Shahji had been ordered ahead, it is said, 'for the defence of the Karnāṭak frontier.' Why? No explanation is given. The next march was to Śakrēpaṭṭana. Śivappa Nāyaka and a number of others are supposed to have joined the expedition. He marched as far as Śivagaṅga in the Tumkur district, where he is said to have received the envoy of Śrīranga Rāyulu of Vellore. There is a note in the Company's records that before January 21, 1646, Śrīranga Rāyulu was attacked by the combined armies of Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa, which would mean that after the previous campaign, in which Bijapur assisted Śrīranga, they changed front and joined Mīr Jumla. It is in the course of the operations connected with this joint attack that Mallaiya surrendered Udayagiri, as it was thought, too readily, and fell into disgrace. That was in February 1646. The combined armies succeeded in inflicting a defeat upon Śrīranga Rāyulu in Vellore. This is apparently what is referred to in the official account, where the ambassadors of Śrīranga Rāyulu are said to have waited upon Mustafa Khan. The Rāyulu apparently made an effort to detach Bijapur from its alliance with Golkoṇḍa. The three rebel Nāyaks of the south, viz., those of Ginjee, Tanjore and Madura, who were apparently opposed to the succession of Śrīranga, and were consequently ill-affected towards him, if not positively disaffected, countenanced the rebellion of the influential brothers, Dāmarla Venkaṭa and Ayyappa. Śrīranga Rāyulu's efforts all along were to bring them to reason and to loyalty. He had not as yet succeeded. It is likely that ambassadors from them also met Mustafa Khan at Śivagaṅga. What is said in this court history is inexplicable unless these details from other sources are put in their setting. Mustafa Khan

refused to be dissuaded from his enterprise on account of these three officers and would not stop till he heard that the Rāyulu's projected invasion was given up. There is a note in the Company's records, dated October 1, 1645, that Śrīranga Rāyulu had obtained a distinct success against the southern rebels, who were coerced into some kind of submission. It was subsequently to that, that the mission to Mustafa Khan must have taken place. The Rāyulu's ambassador was sent back with Mulla Ahmed to get the Rāyulu to agree. Mustafa waited at the head of a pass 28 miles from Vellore. The information is added here that Mustafa's original idea was to detain the Hindu ambassador and send Mulla Ahmed alone. Shahji is said to have persuaded him in the belief that he had obtained a promise of loyalty from the Brahman envoy. The pass here referred to must have been the Nāyakanēri pass, which leads from the present-day Chittoor district into Gudiyāttam. The ambassador is said to have gone and advised Śrīranga Rāyal to attack Mustafa and his army at the pass. Mustafa wanted to make a detour into the territory of Jagadēva Rāyal, that is, the Bāramahāls of the Salem district by what is called 'Kanvi Pass'. There is no Kanvi Pass. *Kanvi* means 'pass'. Instead of descending into the basin of the Pālār, which apparently was guarded in force by Śrīranga Rāyal, Mustafa wanted to make a detour into the Salem district, perhaps with a view to take the Rāyulu in the rear. There again he was attacked by Śrīranga's armies. The Rāyulu himself advanced against the main line and attacked the division left there under Shahji and Asad Khan. Asad Khan is said to have been absent from his command, leaving it to his *Diwān*, so that Shahji was in sole command. After a bloody fight, the Rāyulu's

troops were hurled back and a victory won by Shahji. All the same, the army is said to have marched through the Bāramahāl by way of Ankuśagiri to Krishṇagur, which must be the present-day Krishṇagiri, sometimes called Krishṇagiri Durga. Then taking Vīrabhadra Durga, the capital of that region, the army is said to have marched across and descended into the Pālār basin. From this account it is clear that, Shahji's victory notwithstanding, the army was not able to take the direct line to Gudiyāttam, but had to make a detour, which discounts the victory considerably.

The next section of Sir Jadunath's historians' account speaks of the Bijapur army marching by way of Ānandabād Amarāvati, and Gudiyātam and reaching what is called *Uranjpur*. This is not *Daranchur*, as stated, but *Vrinchipuram*, the capital, in the days of the Hindus, of the Bāṇa country in the Pālār valley. After giving his army some little rest, Mustafa Khan arrived ultimately in front of the walls of Vellore. In the battle that followed, the Rāyulu's general was defeated. Vellore was invested, and ultimately the Rāyulu submitted and agreed to pay 50 lakhs of gold pieces and 150 elephants as indemnity. After a month's halt at Vellore, Mustafa is said to have returned with his army by the same route by which he had approached Vellore. In this decisive battle of the war, Shahji is said to have commanded, along with a certain number of other Hindu officers, the right wing of the Bijapur army: and when Mustafa returned to Bijapur, Asad Khan and Shahji, with many other officers, were left behind to hold the conquered country. Here again there is a very significant omission,

without which it is difficult to appreciate the position. The part which was taken in this campaign by the Golkoṇḍa troops is conspicuous by its omission, notwithstanding the fact that these are official historians, who had access presumably to the despatches and other official documents. There is a note in the Company's records bearing the date January 21, 1646, that Śrīranga was attacked by Golkoṇḍa and Bijapur. Mallaiya played the craven and surrendered Udayagiri on February 9, 1646. The Rāyulu's defeat at Vellore is mentioned, and, significantly enough, it is added that the rebel Nāyaks returned to their allegiance. This looks rather unlike the complete conquest of Vellore and the territory dependent thereon by Mustafa Khan, the general of Bijapur. We have another dated January 1647, that Mir Jumla's agents were active on the eastern side, had taken the Dutch settlement at Pulicat and were marching towards St. Thome reaching within two days' march of the Rāyulu's forces. It was this march of the Golkoṇḍa troops which demoralized the Rāyulu's *Diwān* and made his position untenable in Vellore. He had to flee for the time being for safety and spent some time on forest frontiers of the Tanjore Nāyak's territories, the regions of Ariyalūr, Udayārpāḷayam, etc., on the banks of the Coleroon. In October 1647, the East India Company's factors at Fort St. George felt that the territory had become so for Mir Jumla's that they obtained from him a renewal of the charter which was first granted by Venkaṭapati in 1639, and was renewed by Śrīranga in 1644.

The next section deals with the last of the great campaigns of Mustafa Khan when he marched towards Ginjee

the invasion starting in January 1648. Why they should have marched against Ginjee or undertaken this invasion is not explained as usual. Tirumala Nāyaka of Madura, finding his schemes not prospering by themselves, seems to have striven to effect a combination, as before, between the three Nāyaks of the south, making an effort this time to bespeak the sympathy and good offices of Mir Jumla in their cause. The Tanjore Nāyak betrayed the scheme by divulging it to the emperor. Thus baulked, he succeeded in bringing about an invasion of the Rāyulu's territory by Golkoṇḍa.* Having achieved considerable success, as indicated by the Company's record already quoted, Mir Jumla marched south and laid siege to Ginjee. He sought the good offices of Bijapur and obtained its co-operation. When Ginjee was thus attacked by the victorious Golkoṇḍa troops, whom Tirumala Nāyaka regarded as his allies, Tirumala changed front and came in force to the assistance of the Nāyak of Ginjee. The siege by the combined Muhammadan troops seemed not to prosper particularly, and Tirulmala Nāyaka nearly succeeded in getting the siege raised, when the Golkoṇḍa troops left. Seeing that it would require a lengthy investment, Mir Jumla left the siege to be conducted by the Bijapur troops. These succeeded in putting a garrison into the fort. Mustafa Khan, according to this official account, is brought up to the walls of Ginjee, which offered to surrender, 'except of course, for the disobedience of his chief subordinates like Siddi Raihan and Shahji.' Shahji was put into fetters and brought back to Bijapur. Mustafa Khan died on the way, and the command passed on to Khan Muhammad. Shahjii is said to have been

* *The History of the Nāyaks of Madura* quoted above.

brought in fetters to Bijapur, where the Sultan set him free after negotiating with him for the surrender of the fortress of Kondana, a fortress in the Mahratta country, Bangalore, and a place called Kandarpi in the Bellary district,* restoring him to all his honours and offices. According to the court historian, the Sultan summoned Shahji to his presence, 'giving him the robe of minister, and settled his former lands to him again.' In these authentic sources, there is no other mention of Shahji, and Sir Jadunath concludes the section with the remark that the gap in our knowledge from A.D. 1649 onwards in regard to Shahji's doings can be but inadequately filled by references to Jesuit letters.

The section which relates to the other sources of authority, namely, the letters of Abdullah Quṭub Shah, really gives some valuable information as to the character of the changes that took place in the kaleidoscopic arrangement and re-arrangements of the forces in the Karnāṭak. It refers to the agreement between the two Muhammadan Sultans in regard to the division of the territory of the Rāyal, Bijapur being given two-thirds and Golkoṇḍa retaining a third. The Quṭub Shah complained that the Adil Shah had broken the agreement and had attempted to retain more than his share, whereas the *Muhammad-nāma*, one of the court chronicles, already referred to, states 'that the ungrateful Abdullah—whose forces had been defeated by the Rāyal and who could not have won an inch of the Karnāṭak without Bijapuri support—had formed a secret

* Kandarpi was then a fortified place, now in the Anantapur district.

alliance with the infidel, i.e. the Rāyal, and sent his general Mir Jumla to destroy the Hindus in defence of Ginjee, but that Mir Jumla arrived too late. He was subsequently defeated by another courtier.................of.................the Bijapur general, Bāji Ghorpare.' On the authority of a letter written by Abdullah Quṭub Shah to his Agent in Bijapur of a date corresponding to December 23, A.D. 1647, according to Sir Jadunath, reference is made to a petition from Shahji Bhonsle begging to be taken into the Quṭub Shah's service. The Quṭub Shah is said therein to have repeatedly rejected Shahji's prayer, and advised him to serve the Ādil Shah. Another Hindu Rāja is supposed to have done so, whose name could not, however, be made out clearly. Shahji's arrest by Bijapur is generally ascribed to this attempt on his part to prove traitor to Bijapur. The story of this arrest is given entirely differently in Mahratta sources of history, but the cause may have been perhaps to some extent what it is stated to be here. But even so, it would be rather difficult to accept it altogether as correct without confirmation in the face of the contradiction in Mahratta sources. The fact that Shahji was let off so easily by the Bijapur monarch and his court according to the court chroniclers, would go a long way to show that perhaps this statement is not exactly the truth.

The account of these Muhammadan historians which is by no means friendly to Shahji, makes it abundantly clear, Sir Jadunath's verdict notwithstanding, that from the commencement of his career in the Karnāṭak, Shahji had occupied a position of importance. The first general

under whom he had to serve. Ranadhoola Khan, or as he is called, Khan-i-zamān seems to have been particularly friendly to him, and this very chronicle itself admits that he was appointed to the charge of Bangalore when it was first conquered. It is nowhere stated in the chronicle itself, or anywhere else, that it was taken away from him, even after his treason so-called. As a matter of fact, he seems to have continued to govern those parts of the conquered Channapaṭna viceroyalty, but shifted his government from Bangalore to Chikbalapur, with Kolar as his headquarters and Nandi as his summer residence. There are vestiges of his own work in the fortifications and other structures which bear witness to his occupation of the place. The fact that the Mysore ruler, Chikkadēvarāja Woḍēyār ultimately effected the purchase of Bangalore from Ekoji, Shahji's son in A.D. 1684 would go to show that the family retained possession of Bangalore, notwithstanding the statement in the chronicles that Bangalore was one of the three forts that Shahji was to surrender as a price for his release by the Sultan of Bijapur. His treason with Golkoṇḍa and his arrest consequent thereon are not mentioned in the correspondence of the Company's servants, who were likely to have heard about it, as, in their own particular interest, they kept their eyes and ears open for all possibilities of changes in fortune of the important personalities concerned in the administration of the territory. The fact that Shahji occupied the position of the leader of the campaign against Tanjore and the southern viceroyalties, Mulla Ahmad, called 'Mula' in Jesuit letters, going as only second in command, would go to show that he retained the important position with which he was entrusted at the very commencement of

the Bijapur invasions of the south. That important position he occupied is vouched for by letters of the factors of the East India Company in Madras and the letter of Revington in connection with Daṇḍarājapuri on the Bijapur coast. But the Mahratta tradition, which Sir Jadunath lays aside almost with contempt, claims absolutely nothing more than that he occupied a position of confidence under the commander-in-chief. It was the latter who entrusted him with the charge of administering the great territory, which was ultimately confirmed by the Sultan himself; and it was retained by Shahji even when his patron Rustam-i-zamān had fallen into disgrace and lived away from court. The *Śiva Bhārata*, which is a work compiled, perhaps in Tanjore, tells in a summary fashion much the same story as that recorded by the court chroniclers, to which Sir Jadunath attaches such high value: 'Afterwards along with the commander-in-chief, this great man, the strong-armed, mighty one, reached the Karnāṭaka Maṇḍala; he conquered successfully the ruler of Bindupūr (Beḍnūr) by name Vīrabhadra, the strong one; he also conquered the well-known Kengē Nāyaka, the ruler of Vrishapaṭṭaṇa (Basavapaṭna); the ruler of Kāvēripaṭṭinam, the strong armed Jagadēva, he likewise conquered, as also the cruel Kanṭhīrava, ruler of Śrīrangapaṭna. Then he overthrew the brave Vijayarāghava, the lord of Tanjore, as also the master of Ginjee, the great Venkaṭa Nāyaka. He followed with the overthrow of Tirumala Nāyaka, the lord of Madura; then the ruler of Pilugaṇḍa (Penugoṇḍa ?), by name Venkaṭa Nāyaka, then the brave Śrīrangarāja, ruler of Vidyānagara (Vijayanagara), and then the well-known Tammē Gauḍa of Hamsakūṭapura. In this manner bringing under his control these and other

kings, Rāja Shaji made the commander-in-chief Ranadhoola delighted with his achievements.' Then follows the statement, in two *ślōkas*, that, after a continuous fight for days and nights, 'he took the delightful place, Bangalore from Kempē Gauḍa, who delighted in war, which was presented to him for his own maintenance by the delighted Ranadhoola Khan. He the victorious one (Shahji) resided in the city called Bangalore.' This is a literal rendering of *ślōkas* 37 to 44 of *adhyāya* IX of *Śiva Bhārata*, a work composed poetically, of course, in the life-time of Shivaji himself, probably in Tanjore, far away from the Mahratta country proper. This is confirmed by an account compiled in Tanjore in the days of Rāja Sarfoji by his *Chitnīs* in the Śaka year 1725, Rudirōdgāri, month Chitra, corresponding, as it is given there, to March 25, A.D. 1803. The account begins with a chronological discrepancy in this particular context, where it says that he was despatched on this mission by Āli Ādil Shah, whereas the invasion actually started under Muhammad Ādil Shah, years earlier. The object of the invasion is given as an effort to bring under Bijapur control those feudatories and states of the south which were likely to become friendly with Aurangzeb, who was operating in the Dakhan, and whose attitude towards the southern states of Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa was anything but friendly. Here again the account says that 'Shahji went on the southern invasion with Ranadhoola Khan sent by Ādil Shah. The rulers that he conquered in the south are given as the Rāja of Beḍanūr, Vīrabadra Nāyaka; Kongē Nāyaka, ruler of Kongu (which may be an error—a copyist's error—for Kengē Nāyaka of the territory of Kengē, Kengē being the place of birth of the ruler); Jagadēvarāya of

Kāvēripaṭṭinam, Kanṭhīrava of Srirangapatam, Vijayarāghava of Tanjore, Venkaṭa Nāyaka of Ginjee, Rangasāyi Nāyaka of Vidyānagar (another form of the name Ranga Rāyal); Tirumala Nāyaka of Madura, Harikāra Venkaṭa Nāyaka of Valikoṇḍapuram, Danakōṭi Nāyaka of Hosakōṭa.' Pleased with all these conquests, Ālī Ādil Shah is stated to have given to Shahji the territory of Bangolore for his personal expenses. 'Being pleased with the sight of Bangalore, the security of its fortress, and the salubrity of its climate,' Shahji made up his mind to fix his headquarters there. This is one of the Mackenzie manuscripts noted by Wilson in Volume ii, p. xliv, which purports to be a genealogical account of the Bhonsle Rājas of Tanjore. The claim advanced in favour of Shahji here may be over-pitched to some extent. The account leaves many details to be filled in, and, in that particular respect, is not much worse than the court chronicles so much valued by Sir Jadunath. In this case as in the other, historical research consists in exploiting all possible sources of information for obtaining details of a reliable character to fill in the gaps, and work out a reasonably trustworthy account of the facts. The mere issue of a testimonial that a certain record or set of records is authentic and genuine, because of some features of its character, viz,, that it was an official account, that it was compiled in court, or that it is in a particular language will hardly constitute research work; nor will such contribute to the discovery of historical truth. The first account given above is substantially the same as that given in my *Ancient India*, published in 1911; but the particular thesis, actually written in 1897 and published so long ago as 1900, contains the material taken from the works of a writer who

was contemporary with the Chikkadēvarāja Woḍēyār, who followed not many years (a little over ten years) after the death of Kanṭhīrava Narasa, who figures in these campaigns. The author was a play-fellow and companion at school of the ruler, Chickkadēvarāja, and ultimately became his minister. He composed a work in poetry, *Chikkadēvarāja Vijayam*, in epic form, as also a prose work, *Chikkadēvarāja Vamśāvaḷi*, cast more in the form of history. Along with that is compared such information as is contained in the late compilation issued by the palace and referred to as the Palace History. It is mainly based on the second of the works above referred to, and such other historical manuscipts as were available at the time before the whole library was accidentally burnt. The third source of information utilized is Wilks, who had access to sources such as Grant Duff had for his *History of the Mahrattas*; but, as in the other case, all of his sources are not at present available. The account was actually compiled for Wilks by a Hindu Brahman, by name Nagar Puttaiya Paṇḍit, who occupied a high place in the Secretariat, and who exploited all the records in the archives at Sriranga-patam to compile an account therefrom. Since then certain other Kanarese and Sanskrit sources have become available, and Mr. N. Subba Rao, a research student working on the subject at the Mysore University, utilizes these, particularly the Kanarese sources. As far as I am able to see these, as exhibited by him in the colums of the *Modern Review*, they go merely to confirm the details already given in *Ancient India*, involving perhaps modification of a detail here and a detail there. Historical research consists really in the study of these various sources, estimating their historical

value, each by its own worth, and combining the result of genuine historical criticism of all the sources with a view to compiling a reasonable account of what actually took place.

We have unrivalled means for doing this in the details that lie scattered in the correspondence of the Company's servants, written from all over the Dakhan to their masters at home, English, Dutch and even Portuguese to some extent. The English records have been made available in ten volumes by the indefatigable energy of Sir William Foster, but the details contained therein are not history by design. They are incidental references to the state of affairs in the territories surrounding the factories where their commercial operations were carried on. Their commercial interests required that they should note carefully the smallest changes in the rapidly changing conditions in order to safeguard their interests and their money and promote their trade and profit. They were not particularly concerned with commending one party or condemning another. They had their own personal preferences and predilections, which sometimes showed themselves; but generally they were mainly concerned with noting these political changes accurately—as accurately as was humanly possible—with a view to plying their trade safely and profiting by their business.

Judged by the combined evidence of all these sources of history, Shahji the Mahratta appears to have been a man of ability, both as a soldier and as an administrator. He first played an important part in the conquests of the Karnāṭak for Bijapur. Slowly, but surely, he was able to build up from out of these conquests

a pretty big Goverment for himself, certainly under the authority of his masters at Bijapur to begin with, but gradually to become more or less entirely his own, as a resulty of the inefficiency and dissension that were the ultimate bane of the Bijapur kingdom, with the threat of Mughal conquest hanging, like the sword of Damocles, over its head. It is just possible, although it is not yet satisfactorily established, that he showed himself friendly to the interests of Śrīranga Rāyal once and that he tried to enter the service of the Quṭub Shah another time. Shahji was not the only man that was guilty of such changes. It seems to have been quite common at the time. The supreme example of Mir Jumla in the same region offers an illuminating comparison. The attitude of Rustam-i-zamān and of Bahlol Khan of Bijapur presents a close parallel. Nonetheless, it would constitute treason, notwithstanding the fact that such treason was in the air. The officers to whom Śrīranga Rāyal entrusted his affairs behaved no less badly in regard to this matter, but that would not justify an act of treason morally. Moral justification or denunciation is not, however, the function of the historian. When Bijapur fell, Shahji's work was visible in the existence of the Mahratta state in the south nominally called Tanjore, but extending far into the plateau and comprising a comparatively large portion of the Karnāṭak. Shivaji had been only a feudatory of Bijapur so far as the territory in the Mahratta country was concerned, in spite of the fact that he made himself quite as independent as his father in the south. The southern portion of his father's territory seemed to him more justifiably independent and could perhaps enable him to set himself up as a successor to the

now vanished empire of Vijayanagar, with Śrīranga Rāyal as the last of its rulers. Shahji, therefore, is entitled to be regarded as the founder of the Mahratta dominion in the south, which survived a number of generations after him before it reached complete extinction.

Before concluding this essay on Shahji, it would perhaps be just as well to advert briefly to such memorials as we have of Shahji's position in the south. It is commonly known in Mysore that Shahji's tomb is still pointed out in a village in the Channagiri Taluq of the Shimoga District, not very far from the headquarters of the *jāgīr* of the Kengē Nāyakas. It was Kengē Hanuma, the contemporary of Shahji who was primarily responsible for, at least, one invasion by the Bijapur Sultans. His headquarters, Basavapaṭna, is not very far from the famous Sūḷagere Tank, one of the most important irrigation tanks in the territory of Mysore. We have already referred to the fortress of Nandidrug, and some vestiges that used to be pointed out in the fort at Kolar. It may perhaps be that there are much more living memorials of Shahji's rule in the south in the administration of Mysore territory, particularly in the Survey and Settlement departments. Till recently a large number of the officials belonging to the department were men from the neighbouring southern Mahratta country, holding their positions almost by hereditary succession. Father south, at Ginjee, we have not come across anything connected with Shahji, but farther south again, in the Tanjore District and quite close to the town of Kumbhakonam, is the village now called Śakkōṭṭai, which is about a mile to the south of the railway station.

The name Śakkōṭṭai applied to the fort is a derivative from Shahji, the full name having been Shahjikōṭ. The village Śakkōṭṭai used to consist fifty years ago of the village itself on the banks of the river Araśalār at the southern end of the bridge, and the fort about six furlongs off, containing an old Śiva temple, tanks and other appurtenances of a little fortified town. This Śiva temple is as old as the *Tēvāram* hymnographers, who sang of the place under the name Tirukkalaiyattānkuḍi, the village of the prosperous vessel. The Sanskrit name for the Śiva image installed in the temple, is Amirthagaṭēśvara, *Amirthagaṭa* being translated into Tamil as *Tirukkalaiyam*. It seems to have been fortified only under the Mahrattas, and the forts were dismantled and the stones were used for building the Small Causes Court in Kumbhakonam. I can recollect prisoners being put to this work, and have seen them dismantling the fortress and carrying the stones. It is only within the last twenty-five years that the place has been dismantled of all its fortifications and reduced to an ordinary village. The village itself is associated with another name. The Brahman street is called Raghunāthapura Agrahāram in honour of the Nāyak, Raghunātha of Tanjore, the father of Vijayarāghava, from whom Ekoji conquered the Tanjore District. This Raghunātha it was that met the Vijayanagar prince, Rāma, at Kumbhakonam before the battle aginst the rebels, and took him to safety at Tanjore. When the victory was won, he celebrated the installation ceremony of the Mahārāja in the newly-constructed Rāmaswāmi Temple at Kumbhakonam. In memory of this Raghunātha, the son Vijayarāghava, built this Agrahāram and made it over to Brahmans, and it is said that thirty

families were established in the Agrahāram. Born in that village and in that Agrahāram, I can recollect that the Brahman houses were my father's, his maternal uncle's, and that of two families of Telugu Brahmans, and one house which was actually intended to be a Dharmaśāla. Recently there has been an addition to the Dharmaśāla, by the construction of a new choultry. Otherwise the Agrahāram consists only of one or two households—a fate which is not unusual with Brahman villages now-a-days. The name Shahjikōṭ still survives in the Tamilized form Śakkōṭṭai, which forms a part of my own name.

In the village itself there is a considerable Mahratta settlement from Tanjore. The Mahrattas settled there and in the village Tiruvaḍamaruthūr about four miles to the East, claim to be of better blood than the great bulk of those in Tanjore. In the confusion that arose in Tanjore time and again, several respectable families left the city, and these are found settled in both the villages, thus providing another memento of Mahratta rule.

[*Reprinted from the Journal of Indian History Vol. IX, Part II.*]

Abul Hasan Qutub Shah and his Ministers Madanna and Akkanna.

Madanna and Akkanna were two brothers, who had risen to the position of the chief minister and controller of the military administration of the Quṭub Shahis under the last Qutub Shah Abul Hasan who ruled from A.D. 1672 to 1686–87, when Golkoṇḍa was overthrown and the kingdom was absorbed into the empire of the Mughals under Aurangzeb. Among the collection of copper-plate records belonging to the *Maṭha* of the Śankarāchārya of Kumbakonam, there is one, No. 6, which according to the Epigraphist, refers to the *Maṭha* when still at Kanchi, from which it shifted later on, according to tradition, to Kumbhakonam. It refers to a grant made in Śaka 1608 (A.D. 1686) in Mēlupākkam to one Rāma Sastri on a lunar eclipse from a village already granted to Mahādēvēndra Sarasvati, the predecessor of the teacher of the *Maṭha* at the time, by Madanna and Akkanna. The plates register a grant of land by the teacher to the said Rāma Sastri. The land happened to be in a village granted to the *Maṭha* by the Golkoṇḍa ministers, and hence the reference to them. In referring to this record, the Madras Report on Epigraphy extracts, in section 64 of the report for the year 1915, what the Dutch journal *Hawart* has to say about these two ministers, and reproduces from the journal the original plates containing representations of Abul Hasan Quṭub

Shah, the king, Madanna, the Minister, Akkanna, the general or controller of the forces, and the scene in which these two were killed and dragged along the streets of Golkoṇḍa just before the fall of the city. According to this journal, they were two brothers born of a very poor family and entered service as shroffs in A.D. *1666* on a pay of ten guilders per mensem under Saiyyad Mustapah, a nobleman of Golkoṇḍa, *known to fame as Mir Jumla.* Madanna, *alias* Sūryaprakāśa Rao, is stated by the Dutch journalist to have been an intelligent man, whereas his brother Akkanna was a man of cunning and roguery with very little of understanding. The brothers are said in the journal to have risen to rank by an act of treachery, which deprived Mir Jumla of his high office under the Quṭub Shah of Golkoṇḍa. Madanna is said to have become a prominent figure in the administration of the kingdom which the Sultan left entirely to his management and was satisfied with 75,000 dollars for his personal use. Madanna is said to have been a man well versed in Persian, Hindustani and the vernaculars of the country. According to this authority, he lived in a kingly style, and, at sight of his golden palanquin in which he went about the streets, people showed their respect by stopping on the way. This journal acknowledges that he was very kind to the Dutch, and that the author 'had the honour of seeing Madanna often'. The author of the report on epigraphy follows it by adding the information that the high position, to which they attained under Abdullah Quṭub Shah, they were not able to maintain for long, as Aurangzeb marched with his army into Golkoṇḍa, and plundered the house of Madanna who is stated, on what authority we do not know, to have

been accused of high treason by the people, and, under the orders of the Sultan, were murdered. What follows is not of very particular interest to the history of these ministers. The only other piece of information that this report gives regarding them is that it mentions their nephew, Rāmadās, who was the Tahsildar of Bhadrāchalam. He spent away the money of the government in building a temple to his favourite god Rāma, suffered imprisonment and torture therefore, and was ultimately miraculously saved by the intervention of Rāma and his brother Lakshmaṇa, who appeared at dead of night, paid the Sultan the amount due personally, and obtained a receipt of acquittance therefor.'* That is as far as the information, in the Dutch journal, can take us.

Madanna and Akkanna were undoubtedly ministers of Golkoṇḍa under the last Quṭub Shah, Abul Hasan, generally known as Tana Shah, the gay and happy king, According to Professor Sarkar, Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah succeeded to the throne of his predecessor under somewhat peculiar circumstances. Abdullah Quṭub Shah died in A.D. 1672 leaving behind him only three daughters, and no son. Of the three daughters of Abdullah Quṭub Shah, Aurangzeb's son had married the second daughter. The first was married to one Sayyad Ahmad, a pure-blooded Arab claiming descent from the noble families of Mecca. He was at the time *de facto* ruler of the state. The third daughter was to be married to a protege of this Sayyad Ahmad, but the arrangement broke off as the result of a domestic quarrel. In order to serve his interests best, this

* See also Sarkar's *Aurangzeb*, Vol. iv. pp. 353–5.

powerful son-in-law Sayyad Ahmad brought about the choice of Abdul Hasan, said to have been descended on the father's side from the Quṭub Shahi family itself and was at the time leading a lazy life, as a disciple of the saint Sayyad Raju Kaṭhal. He seems to have served his master well, and a jocular remark of the saint is said to have turned true when he was, to his great surprise, dragged from his humble position, and elevated to the rank of a son-in-law of the Sultan. When Abdullah Quṭub Shah died, everything indicated that the powerful first son-in-law, Sayyad Ahmad should, in the ordinary course, have succeeded to the throne. His over-weening character, and perhaps the rigour of his administration, made him unpopular, and an influential party at court headed by Sayyad Muzaffar, a general of high Persian origin, and Musa Khan Mahaldàr, managed to overpower Sayyad Ahmad and put Abul Hasan on the throne. Accordingly Abul Hasan was crowned king, Sayyad Muzaffar became his minister, Musa Khan, officer in command, almost next in rank. The new Wazir is however said to have attempted to turn his master into a cypher by his greed of power and policy. Exasperated at this attitude of the minister 'Abul Hasan bought over Madanna, the Brahman factotum of Muzaffar and through him corrupted most of the captains to his personal followers, so that one day Muzaffar was quietly deprived of his Wazirship, which was conferred on Madanna with the title of Sūryaprakāśa Rao.* This change of ministers is said by the same authority to have taken place about A.D. 1673. Sir Jadunath continues 'his brother Akkanna became commandar-in-chief and his nephew, the gallant and

* Sarkar's *Aurangzeb*, Vol. iv. p. 334.

learned Yengena, surnamed Rustum Rao, was given high command. Musa Khan too was sent into retirement and Muhammad Ibrahim, a creature of Madanna, was created *Sar-i-khel*, master of the horse, and then premier peer (great Nawab) for a bribe of 1,10,000 *hun* paid to Madanna.'* The learned Professor does not indicate the exact source for this particular statement, but we hope to take it that the statement is made on authority. It would be clear at once that there is really something incompatible between the two statements if Madanna started life as shroff on a salary of ten guilders, as is stated by the writer in the *Hawart*, in 1666, he could not have risen to the commanding position that he held in 1673. That that statement of the journal is absurd is clear when it says that he started on his humble career as shroff in 1666, and under Mir Jumla. Mir Jumla was not in Hyderabad in 1666, nor is it correct to say that Mir Jumla suffered at the hands of Abdullah Quṭub Shah through the intrigues of Madanna and Akkanna. Therefore notwithstanding the knowledge that the writer claims of having been in personal touch with Madanna his information relative to the earlier career of Madanna cannot be held to be correct. Sir Jadunath, who quotes this in an appendix, omits the name Mir Jumla, although he quotes from the same epigraphist's report. It is clear therefore that the two accounts leave something to be desired. According to Sir Jadunath, Madanna already occupied the position of *de facto* minister under Sayyad Muzaffar, and so his rise to the position of chief minister was due to the masterfulness of Muzaffar, and the fear of Abul Hasan that his position in the state was being

* *Ibid.*

reduced to one of no influence. That such an important official as Muzaffar should be removed from his office, and that a Brahman official like Madanna should have been raised to his position, as quietly as it is described to have taken place, would naturally lead to the inference that there was perhaps nothing very unusual in the step taken to deprive one minister of his power or to instal another in the place for one thing; and it would show Abul Hasan Tanashah was not such a hopless, reckless and ease-loving administrator that he is generally represented to be by this author himself. Sūryaprakāśa Rao was not a title conferred on Madanna. Sūryaprakāśa Rao must have been his name, Madanna being more or less a familiar name, by which he must have been known among his own people, the proper name being the other. Assuming therefore that both Madanna and Akkanna started life, as in fact most people of that class did, in a comparatively humble position, they must have risen to the high place that they occupied by sheer dint of work, and not without worth. While it is probable that they started service in such a small position under Mir Jumla, that start could not have been in A.D. 1666. It must have been very much earlier, and in the circumstances, it seems very probable that their entry into service was owing to Mir Jumla's capacity for discerning merit where it could be found. That apart, we may take it that these two Brahman brothers entered early in their life, and very probably under Mir Jumla in a comparatively small capacity as revenue officials of some kind. Through perhaps a score of years they had risen to the high position, and had attained, if not to the titles and dignities, at any rate, to the real power of being controllers of the finances

of the state under ministers during the reign of Abdullah Quṭub Shah himself. When therefore Abul Hasan ascended the throne, he had naturally to fall back upon the party which was in power, and as that party was headed by Sayyad Muzaffar and his friend Musa Khan they were both of them entrusted with power; and when Abul Hasan discovered, that he was being reduced to a cypher in the administration, he naturally had the foresight to take opportunity by the forelock and deprive the ambitious minister of his power before it became too late for him to do it, as it happened in the case of Mir Jumla under his predecessor. In those circumstances, if Abul Hasan fell back upon the Brahman ministers instead of some of his Muslim officials, it must have been on the ground that to him it seemed, in the circumstances, that he could depend upon officials of his own creation rather than the hereditary nobility, or even men of rank, who had attained to their position under his predecessor. Whatever be the motive of Abul Hasan, we have so far the fact that Madanna and Akkanna, the brothers, were chosen to carry on the administration for Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah, some time in the year 1673, and perhaps 1674, as one of the letters from Fort St. George mentions the change to have taken place just before the date of the letter in 1674.*

We have some little information from extraneous sources for what Madanna and Akkanna did as ministers, and what sort of a ruler Abul Hasan turned out to be, though such information as is available to us is hardly enough

* Letter dated November 21, 1674. No mention of the new minister in letter of May 15, 1673.

to help us to a complete history of the careers of these. The main events or incidents that took place under the administration of these are more or less indisputably on record. The differences which are certainly wide, are in respect of the motives that induced the particular lines of action adopted and policies put into effect during the last years of existence of the state of Golkoṇḍa as a kingdom. To understand therefore the career of either the sovereign, Abul Hasan or his ministers, the Brahman brothers, we shall have to take into account the condition of affairs in the years following 1672 and cast about for the events of importance in which they played an influential part. It is only then that we can arrive at something like a tenable judgment as to the character and motives of action of any one or all of these.

The year 1672 is a year of great importance in the history of South India in various ways, and the position of parties and affairs were in an unstable equilibrium and held out no promise whatsoever of any permanence. Since the extinction of the Nizam Shahi state, the Mughals had become, in a sense, a Dakhani power as well; and their movements had an important influence upon the shaping of the politics of South India. A Mughal Viceroy was stationed in Daulatabad, and his function was to keep watch over his neighbours in the south, and advance the Mughal power southwards as opportunity offered to gradually reduce his southern neighbours to a condition of complete tutelage to the Mughals, if not of reduction to subordination which perhaps may be considered the ultimate end of the Dakhan policy of the Mughals. The three powers, whose position the Mughal viceroy of the Dakhan had to

keep watch over were : the Mahrattas under Shivaji occupying the territory on this side of the Ghats and making an effort at conquering and occupying the coast region as far as could be done without getting into a regular conflict with the Mughals. This activity took him all over the Konkan coast from Surat down to South Kanara under the Nāyaks of Ikkēri, one of the provinces of the empire of Vijayanagar at the time. The Mahratta power was nominally subordinate to the kingdom of Bijapur, but actually it comported itself as though it was an independent state with a policy of its own, and called for the first attention of the Mughal government in the Dakhan. In Bijapur itself Ali Adil Shah died, and was succeeded by a baby, Sikandar ; and the state suffered from all the evils of a regency in a state dominated by factions contending for the most influential position. In Bijapur as in the Dakhan States before, there were the three parties, the Mughal, the Afghan, and the Habshi, sometimes resolving itself into the Dakhani, the Afghan and the Mughal. The regency was to begin with under Khawas Khan, the head of the Dakhani party. He was overthrown and assassinated by the Afghan party, and this Afghan party tried to secure the support of the Mughal governor for the time being under Diler Khan, who was himself an Afghan. In this confusion and struggle, the state was hardly in a condition to exercise its authority normally, and had therefore been politically paralysed. For the time therefore, Bijapur was in no condition either to molest Shivaji, or to be a source of anxiety to the Mughals.

As was pointed out already, there was a change of rulers in Golkoṇḍa, Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah being put

upon the throne in succession to Abdullah Quṭub Shah his predecessor, the government being in the hands of Sayyad Muzaffar Khan and Musa Khan, the two men that were responsible for this succession. In the course of a year, or two, they had made themselves so objectionable to Abul Hasan that he deprived both of them of their power, and had advanced instead the Brahman brothers, Madanna and Akkanna to the chief positions in the state. Golkoṇḍa was therefore in a condition, as formerly, to quietly extend its authority to the southward with some effect, and showing itself to some extent active on the northern side, at least to put up an effective defence against the advance of the Mughals. From this position of parties, it will be clear that the Mughal danger was real and the Mughal power hung like a Damocles' sword on the three southern powers, and their position of independence depended entirely upon their capacity to defend themselves against Mughal aggression, which was likely to come whenever an opportunity offered itself. It was not like providing for a possible contingency; much rather it was a real danger, a watchful attention to ward off which having become the immediate objective of the southern states.

Behind the territories, under the immediate authority of Shivaji, Sikandar Adil Shah, and Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah lay what was the empire of Vijayanagar which had come to be now divided into a number of principalities. The territory lying on the easternmost side and extending along the coast from Masulipatam to almost, at any rate, as far as Madras, and extending into the interior to the Anantapur District and the Ghats farther south, was the part that

Golkoṇḍa had conquered from out of the falling empire of Vijayanagar, which under the last emperor Śrīranga III had not yet given up the ambition of recovering the lost territory, though the chances seemed against its realisation. Immediately to the west of this lay the Bijapur conquest from out of Vijayanagar, taking into it the eastern half of what is the present state of Mysore, and the margin of territory along its eastern frontier leading southwards through the Bāramahāls of Salem into the South Arcot District and extending almost to the banks of the Kāvēri and the Coleroon in the lower reaches of the delta. This territory was ruled over by a number of petty chieftains placed in salient positions who were holding their power in subordination to Bijapur so long as that state was in a condition to assert its authority. But in a period of weakness, such as at this particular time when the state was hardly in a condition to exercise effective authority, they ruled almost independently of the headquarters. South of this region was the Nāyakship of Tanjore immediately on the other side of the Kāvēri, with Tanjore as its capital. The Nāyakship of Madura was the next principality with its capital at Trichinopoly, Madura still retaining its importance as the historical headquarters of the viceroyalty of Madura under Vijayanagar. To the north of the Nāyakship of Madura, and in touch with the whole of its northern frontier lay the territory of the Woḍēyārs of Mysore, and in the year A.D. 1672 a change of ruler had taken place. The old Mahārāja Dēvarāja Woḍēyār I died, and was succeeded by a nephew, Chikkadēvarāja Woḍēyār, a younger and more masterful man, who cherished the ambition of extending his power and enhancing his prestige, as the

imperial power seemed almost at its last gasp. Just to the north of it, in what is now the Malnāḍ Districts of Mysore, lay the state of Ikkēri, which, at this time, had extended its authority down to the west coast and came into touch on the western and northern frontier with the territory of the Mahrattas under the authority of Shivaji. This state had to maintain its position as against the European powers, the Portuguese and the Dutch struggling for possession of salient positions on the West Coast, and against the Mahrattas in the north.

Through the whole of this region, the position at the time was complicated by the presence of the last emperor of Vijayanagar, Śrī Ranga Rāyal, making an effort as yet to retain the imperial authority and regain something of the suzerainty that he had been gradually losing through a struggle of over a score of years. His position had so far been damaged that the feudatory powers were going on with their wars and campaigns without reference to him, and it looked as though his power had effectively vanished. He had not yet given up hope, and, in spite of the Bijapur conquests of Ginjee under the joint command of Shahji and Moula, he still made one effort, and seems to have had, in that effort, the support of a number of his feudatories who had previously showed themselves hostile to him. This grand effort was made in the reign of Chokkanātha Nāyaka of Madura, when all the powers supported the claims of Śrī Ranga Rāyal as against the ruler of Mysore. A battle was fought near Erode. The Mysoreans gained the victory in that. That seems to have dispelled such hope as the Emperor Śrī Ranga Rāyal has had of reviving

his authority for ever. The emperor became a fugitive, and found an asylum in the court of Ikkēri, which made one more effort on Mysore. This resulted in no good to the emperor, and his pretensions so far as Mysore went. We hear no more of the emperor afterwards, and we might mark the end of Vijayanagar practically with that.

We have to make ourselves clear in respect of dates for these events, and particularly the two attempts in favour of the emperor. According to the Mysore accounts, the effort made in behalf of Śrī Ranga Rāyal, in which even the name of Shahji's son Ekoji figures on behalf of the emperor, was defeated by the general of Dēvarāja Woḍēyār while Chikkadēvarāja Woḍēyār, as a prince, volunteered his services when the kingdom was threatened by this danger. Dēvarāja was an old man, and was rather perplexed as to the general to whom the campaign against this formidable combination was to be entrusted. In that position Chikkadēvarāja Woḍēyār volunteered his services from Tirukaṇāmbi, where he was living with his tutors undergoing education as yet. The battle therefore of Erode in favour of the emperor Śrī Ranga Rāyal must have taken place near the end of the reign of Dēvarāja, and before Chikkadēvarāja Woḍēyār ascended the throne in 1672. Inscriptions of Chokkanātha, the ruler of Madura are found in Kumaralingam and Tiruchengode ascribed to the years 1667-1668, while inscriptions of Dēvarāja Woḍēyār of about 1670 are found at and near Satyamangalam. The battle must have been fought between these years. Very probably the battle was fought in the year 1669-70. Śivappa Nāyaka of Ikkēri is said to have sent an expedition against Chikkadēvarāja Woḍēyār

soon after his accession in 1672. It is just possible that this invasion took place in the year 1672 or 1673. Thus the last shred of hope of reviving the empire under Śrī-Rānga Rāyal vanished with 1674 or 1675, the last possible year. As a matter of fact, about this time or a little later, we hear of an invasion, according to the *Rāma-Rājīyamu*, undertaken by another scion of the ruling family, Kōdandarāma, who advanced at the head of an army as far as Hassan and Sakkrepaṭna, and was driven back by Chikkadēvarāja Woḍēyār. This invasion under Kodandarāma must have been after the death of Śri Ranga Rāyal, and therefore about 1675—it may be even 1674—perhaps the last date known for Śrī Rānga III. With him vanished perhaps the empire of Vijayanagar as a real, political entity, and what constituted the provinces of the empire therefore could regard themselves rightfully as independent kingdoms, as in fact they had been doing for some time before. Thus the province of Ginjee was under Bijapur. The territory belonging to Vijayanagar to the north of Madras belonged to Golkoṇḍa. The Nāyakships of Tanjore and Madura were in perpetual conflict with each other, and the Tanjore Nāyakship was nearing its end. Mysore and Ikkēri on the plateau maintained themselves in a position of some importance, and could not be said to have adopted an effective policy of mutual friendship and alliance. Ikkēri had to maintain herself against various enemies of her own, which kept her engaged on her western frontier, and the activity of the Mahrattas kept them engaged on the northern. So Mysore was free to pursue, her own policy of active expansion into the territory on its northern frontier. Such was the position of affairs in the

south when Shivaji's attention was turned that way, and called for the adoption of a policy of intervention in the affairs of the south, for which he sought the assistance of Golkoṇḍa, and brought the diplomatic and administrative talents of Madanna and Akkanna into play.

Affairs in Tanjore were moving fast, and effectively called for the intervention of Shivaji. The last Nāyak Vijayarāghava of Tanjore had shown himself by no means friendly to Chokkanātha Nāyaka of Madura. Hostility seems to have been the cardinal principle of policy between these two states ever since the Civil War that followed the death of the great Venkaṭapati Rāyal in 1614. That attitude continued generally unbroken, and, as occasion offered itself, the two states went to war with each other without any influencing cause other than this. Occasions offered themselves now and again for one reason or another. Chokkalinga in the course of one of his wars against the Maravas of Ramnad took the fortress of Vallam on the Tanjore frontier, which Vijayarāghava soon recovered. The hostility thus engendered increased when, as the local accounts have it, Chokkanātha asked for the hand of one of the daughters of Vijayarāghava in marriage. The reply given to this was negative, and referred to an older incident of a domestic character not complimentary to Madura, and thus fanned the flame. In the war that ensued Vijayarāghava was defeated and killed as also his son, and, in the holocaust of the victims of the royal family in that falling fort of Tanjore, a baby Chengamaladās, as he was called, son of Vijayarāghava's son, alone escaped through the efforts of his dying mother and a nurse. When Madura conquered Tanjore,

Chokkalinga appointed a half-brother of his to conduct the administration of Tanjore on his behalf. That half-brother turned traitor, and possibly he sought the intervention of Shahji in Ginjee; but Shahji's intervention seems to have been brought about in behalf of the baby, and nominally under the authority of Bijapur. Shahji's officers under command of Ekoji, otherwise known as Venkaji, marched forward, turned out Chokkanātha's cousin for lack of assistance from him, and placed Chengamaladās on the throne. Very soon there was trouble, and the administration under a baby suffered from the disadvantages natural to such an administration, and Ekoji's intervention was sought again, and this time Ekoji conquered and occupied Tanjore, not to give it back again to any scion of the Tanjore family. He might have taken possession even of Trichinopoly if he had made a strenuous effort, but he thought it prudent not to draw upon himself the whole force of Madura—it may be even others in alliance—and therefore was content with the conquest of Tanjore. The first years of the administration are reported to have been very good.*

The government seems to have been placed in the hands of experienced administrators, the two brothers Raghunātha Nārāyan Hanumante and Janārdana Nārāyan Hanumante, sons of the old Karbari of Shahji by name Naro Tirumal Hanumante. The father was a faithful servant of Shahji, and naturally the sons were trained for the same service, and were already occupying responsible positions under Shahji in the administrative line. They were entrusted therefore with the civil administration of Tanjore,

* Jesuit Letters: *Nāyaks of Madura*, pp. 279-80.

while Ekoji was placed at the head of the administration. The father's officers naturally assumed a paternal attitude in carrying on the administration, and caused dissatisfaction probably to the rising ambition of Ekoji, whose army and officers seem to have contained a good contingent of Mussalmans, as armies even nominally of Bijapur were bound to contain. Young Ekoji began to chafe under the authority assumed by the older officials, and in this attitude was perhaps egged on by some of the Muhammadan officers near him, as against the Brahman civil administrator, an attitude not unusual under the Muhammadan governors of the Dakhan generally. This made Raghunātha Nārāyan throw up his office, and, without doing damage to his state, he thought it best to lay the whole matter before Sivaji, who, in the opinion of the Karbari, was likely to take a more reasonable line of action, and whose opinion might possibly prevail for good over the brother. So Raghunātha Nārāyan broke up his establishment, and with his brother and nephew and two other trusted officers of the group marched up through the territory of Ginjee northwards through Golkoṇḍa back to Sivaji. This journey of Raghunātha Nārāyan happened to synchronise with the vanishing of the power of the emperor of Vijayanagar, and it must have struck him that the authority of Vijayanagar having become non-existent practically, the territories over which the empire had suzerain claim were likely to be going without a suzerain. As an old official with the most thorough knowledge of the condition of affairs in the kingdom of Bijapur, he must have also realized that there would be no possibility of assertion of Bijapur authority over the territories conquered by Shahji in behalf of Bijapur; so that the territory included in the

government of Ginjee, the territories under the governments of Tanjore, and the other small governments under Bijapur to the northward of Ginjee, all of them alike seemed to him to be in a condition fit for appropriation by one that could conquer them and hold possession of them effectively. He therefore thought that the best service that he could do to his master Shahji, and, after his death, his sons, more particularly Sivaji, was to make it possible for him to take possession of all that was Shahji's and add to it his own part of the territory in Mahārāshtra, so that the so-called Bijapur *jāghīrs* of Shahji may remain intact in the family. Whether the idea dawned upon him that the disappearance of the empire of Vijayanagar opened a new vista of imperial ambition may well be doubted though it does not seem impossible if Gāga Bhatt could entertain a similar idea that led to Sivaji's coronation. It would be nothing strange if the vision dawned on him. Anyhow there was the more practical question which the *Sar-karkun* could, and did understand, in going forward to lay the matter before his master. He thought he might as well prepare the way for he carrying out of the project, as far as he could do it without authority from his master Sivaji. He visited Golkoṇḍa where already Madanna and Akkanna were in the ascendant so far as the actual exercise of power and the formulation of a policy went. Raghunātha learnt the partiality of Madanna for Sanskrit learning, particularly on the side of religion and philosophy, and, being a very learned man himself, he thought he could turn his talents to purpose. He went there as a mere learned Brahman, and soon showed his talents which received the fullest mead of appreciation from Madanna. Raghunātha soon became

the much-respected guest of the great minister. He sought and obtained opportunites for confidential discussion of the matter occupying his mind at that time, and prevailed upon the minister to consent to a policy of an offensive and defensive alliance with Sivaji as the best course of action to be adopted in the circumstances, both as against the advancing tide of Mughal aggression, and as the best safeguard for the preservation of, what was worth preserving, the Hindu India of the south which was fast vanishing before their very eyes. Madanna's part in this affair is one of the cardinal facts of the Quṭub Shahi administration upon which Madanna is to be judged as to his loyalty and capacity for rule. We shall consider therefore, in the circumstances, whether the course of action adopted by him was in the best interest of the state that he served or no.

At the time that Raghunātha Nārāyan was returning to the Mahratta country from Tanjore, and passing through Golkoṇḍa on his way, the position of affairs happened to be somewhat as follows :—the kingdom of Bijapur was under the regency of Abdul Karim Buhlol Khan, the Afghan, who was in alliance with Diler Khan, the Mughal governor, and the Afghan party was in the ascendant. This personal relationship naturally threw Bijapur into the arms of the Mughals ; and Bijapur thus detached, the Mughal danger became far more real both to the Mahrattas and the rulers of Golkoṇḍa. It was about that time that Bahadur Khan came into the command of the Mughal government. Diler Khan in combination with Bijapur made a joint attack on Shivaji, and the war was conducted on both sides somewhat languidly, as the emperor himself was moving towards

Hasan Abdal against the Khaibar Afghans, who had risen in revolt. Diler Khan was called to the north-western frontier, and Bahadur Khan was sent in his stead for the charge of the Dakhan. A successful expedition against Bahadur Khan was undertaken about the end of October, and the war was carried on in the following months till about the February of the next year. Then Shivaji opened negotiations with Bahadur Khan, and ultimately came to an understanding with him. But the negotiations proved futile, as they were probably intended to be on the side of Shivaji, and Aurangzeb cautioned Bahadur Khan from falling into the snares of Shivaji again. Having garrisoned his forces and supplied them with provisions, Shivaji threw off the mask, and brought down upon him an invasion from Bahadur Khan of a more active character than usual. Sweeping through the Mahratta country, he came down upon Bijapur and pressed Bijapur hard. Bijapur under the regency of Bulol Khan, sought the assistance of Shivaji, and, in return for a contribution of 300,000 *huns* annually, he undertook to assist Bijapur against the Mughals. But very soon this understanding broke off and Shivaji felt free to proceed further. Bahadur Khan continuing his attack on Bijapur, Shivaji had nothing to fear from that government. But it was worth while coming to an understanding with Bahadur Khan. On the initiative of Bahadur Khan a peace was concluded between Shivaji and the Mughal viceroy, and something like a peace was patched up for the time being. Bijapur being thrown out of action, and the Mughal government of the Dakhan being under alliance of some kind, Shivaji was able to put into practice the scheme adumbrated by Raghunāth Nārāyan. He naturally therefore looked

towards Golkoṇḍa, the passivity of which, if active co-operation was impossible, was absolutely essential to him, in case he should mature his plans of carrying out the schemes of Raghunāth Nārāyan in the Karnāṭak.

The Golkoṇḍa government under Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah and Madanna Pandit, his chief minister, found themselves in a rather more dangerous position than usual. We pointed out already that the safety of these southern governments lay in their acting together and adopting a common policy at least as against the Mughals. That was the really advantageous policy for them to adopt, and, at any rate, they tried to do so on occasions. Now more than ever, it was necessary for them to provide themselves against the activity of the Mughals under Bahadur Khan. Bahadur Khan having got into an agreement with Shivaji, and seeing that the Bijapur government was powerless to do anything effective against him, was bound to pursue a more active policy as against Golkoṇḍa. The immediate neighbour of Bijapur being out of action, it was to the best interest of the Golkoṇḍa rulers to get into alliance with Shivaji if possible, and thus provide themselves against any successful attack by Bahadur Khan, whatever be the Quṭub Shahi policy in respect of the Karnāṭak. An alliance with Shivaji therefore, apart from his intentions in regard to the Karnāṭak, was essential to the Quṭub Shahs. If Shivaji was impelled towards gaining the alliance of Golkoṇḍa for his Karnāṭak enterprise, Golkoṇḍa was under no less imperious need for getting into alliance with him to keep off the Mughals. But so long as the Mughal general was occupied with Bijapur, they can countenance such movements as

Shivaji might make on the southern territories of Bijapur, which certainly did require being put into order even in the interests of Golkoṇḍa. Shivaji therefore persuaded the Golkoṇḍa government to come to an agreement with him; and both Madanna the minister and Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah, the sovereign, found it to their interest to enter into a definite agreement with Shivaji, and permit him to carry on his southern campaign, which after all was to all appearance, to put his father's *jāghīr* into order and put an end to the anarchical condition of the south. So the two states entered into an offensive and defensive alliance after a visit to Golkoṇḍa by Shivaji. Shivaji was allowed to undertake a campaign in the south, Golkoṇḍa providing him with the sinews of war, and a contigent of troops, particularly artillery in which arm Shivaji's army was weak. Shivaji was to receive a subsidy of 3,000 *huns* a day and should be assisted by an army of 5,000 men together with a train of artillery. Shivaji was to give Golkoṇḍa in return therefor such parts of the conquest in the Karnāṭak as did not belong to his father Shahji. The treaty did contain a condition of a common defensive alliance against the Mughals.

In regard to this treaty and the consequent facilities provided for Shivaji's invasion of the Karnāṭak, it is beyond question that Madanna had a very important share of responsibility, notwithstanding the fact that he had the completest support of Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah. Whether that was a policy which was to the advantage of Golkoṇḍa or no, is really what ought to guide us in our judgment of the part that Madanna played in bringing about this. What

was the position of Golkoṇḍa at the time, and whether it stood to gain or lose by the alliance are really the only issues that ought to decide this question. Golkoṇḍa was in constant danger of being overrun by the Mughal army and her frontiers, particularly the north-western frontier, were entirely open to Mughal operations. The Bijapur government having been thrown out of action, as was stated already, the only security for keeping the Mughal from the frontier consisted in an alliance with the Mahrattas. To that extent so far as that part of the treaty is concerned, it was undoubtedly for the advantage of Golkoṇḍa that they should get into an alliance with Shivaji. What was the interest of Golkoṇḍa in the operations of Shivaji in the Karnāṭak? It was pointed out before that the Karnāṭak was hardly in a satisfactory condition, particularly the Bijapur part of it. The greater part of Bijapur conquests in the Karnāṭak was directly or indirectly under the rule of Shahji, and after him his son Ekoji; and such portions as were not directly under Ekoji's rule were more or less in a condition of anarchy, ready to fall an easy prey to any enterprising power that was in a condition to take advantage of it. Mysore and Madura showed themselves to some extent active in this direction. Their ascendency would inevitably bring on the destruction of Tanjore sooner or later. In the condition of affairs that prevailed, the state which attempted to remain stationary was bound to suffer in the long run. The authority of the Bijapur government over her southern possessions was of the slightest. Even in the interest of Bijapur, it would be very much better that they be brought under one common authority and if possible, under the nominal authority of

Bijapur itself. But that was not very much to the interest of Golkoṇḍa. The affairs of Golkoṇḍa required perpetual vigilance all along the frontier between the territories of Bijapur and those of Golkoṇḍa. This can never be regarded as satisfactory so long as the Mughal Viceroyalty of the Dakhan continued to exist. Hence if Shivaji could guarantee a more satisfactory condition of the whole of the Karnāṭak as a result of the expedition, Golkoṇḍa had something substantial to gain thereby, although undoubtedly Shivaji would be infinitely the greater gainer.

There is one other possible question in regard to this. Shivaji had now crowned himself king. At least some of the Mahratta Bakhairs give indications of their not having been unaware of a kingdom going by default in the south, now that the empire of Vijayanagar had passed into the unknown. There might have been that ambition in Shivaji of creating for himself a kingdom, which he could maintain itself in independence, and out of reach of the arms of the Mughals. If Gāga Bhaṭṭ could think of it, as the Sabhasad Bakhair makes it clear, it might as well have dawned upon himself and upon Raghunāth Nārāyan Hanumante. Whether Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah could sympathise with a movement like that may be open to doubt. But that Madanna could have been in active sympathy if such an idea had been put before him may be presumed; but whether it was put before him or not, we have no means of knowing, although it seems exceedingly likely that Raghunāth Pant would have put it before him, and might have received a sympathetic reply therefor. Since the advantages to Golkoṇḍa of the treaty were so direct in other particulars

it would not perhaps be proper to put this possibility as counting against the actual loyalty of the Hindu minister to the Muhammadan Sultan of Golkoṇḍa. We have very good reason to believe that since the accession of Madanna to the chief power in the state, efforts have been constantly made to introduce some kind of an order in the southern acquisitions of Golkoṇḍa. That was a matter of great difficulty as long as the emperor Śrī Ranga lived and moved effectively, though practically a fugitive. Now that he had vanished, this state of affairs may as well be put an end to, and one way of doing it is to let Shivaji acquire possession of what was his father's territory, in order that the much-needed peace may prevail in the south, even to the comfort of the Golkoṇḍa rulers in regard to their southern territory.

According to the records of Fort St. George, Abdul Hasan's reign began with Sayyad Muzaffar Khan as the chief minister, and Musa Khan, Khan-i-Khanan as the Golkoṇḍa governor of the Karnāṭak, a position almost exactly like that of Mir Jumla before he went over to the Mughals.* The document under advertence refers to the death of Neknam Khan, who granted a cowle for Fort St. George in the first instance, and to the arrangements in succession. Neknam Khan was succeeded in the chief ministership by Sayyad Muzaffar Khan, and in the Nawab-ship of the Karnāṭak by Musa Khan. Venkaṭapati, the Brahman agent of the Company in Golkoṇḍa was sent with presents to the new Nawab, and the record contains a resolution sanctioning an expenditure of 500 pagodas for presents, etc., to the new Nawab on his first visit. The

* *Factory Records of Fort St. George*, Vol. I, 25th April 1672.

cowle that was given by Neknam Khan for the possession of Fort St. George was confirmed by his successor Musa Khan as Nawab of the Karnāṭak. This state of things seems to have continued for two years and about the end of the year 1674, or early the next year, both Sayyad Muzaffar and Musa Khan were turned out of office, and Madanna and Akkanna took their place respectively. It is after this that a change of local administration took place, and gradually the *tarafdārs* had changed and finally the whole administration. Musa Khan was succeeded by a Muhammadan official by name Nandar Khan. He seems to have been succeeded by Ibrahim Khan, and in succession to him Akkanna becomes governor of the Karnāṭak. This change seems to have taken place somewhere about 1675. We get a reference to it for the first time in a record of date 21st November, 1674, and again in one of 16th July 1675, and Podili Linganna, the nephew of Madanna and Akkanna, became Tarafdār of Poonamallee, within whose territory Fort St. George was situate. With the coming in of Podili Linganna, there was a stiffening in the administration, and the understanding between the government of Fort St. George and that of the Tarafdār was one more or less of open hostility. This change of position is fully described in a British document O.C. 4215 dated 23rd July 1676.* According to this letter both Muzaffar Khan and Musa Khan were set aside; Chinnapalli Mirza, as he is called, in front of San Thome was killed by poisoning, and the former Tarafdār Pollepalle Venganna was removed from office. It was this document that contains a statement that Muhammad Ibrahim was

* Quoted in Love's *Vestiges of Old Madras* Vol. I, p. 356.

made the great Sarkel, Sar-i-Khel, for a consideration of 1,10,000 pagodas. The cause of the differences between Lingappa, the nephew of the brothers, Madanna and Akkanna, and of the government at Fort St. George concerned more or less the position of Fort St. George in relation to the Government of Golkoṇḍa. The first point at issue was whether they were answerable to the Tarafdār of Poonamallee in whose division Fort St. George was situated. From out of this sprang various others, such as the collection of rent, the trade between the fort and the territory immediately outside, the customs revenue which the fort was bound to pay, the various changes in the condition of Fort St. George that took place as a result of the changed circumstances in its immediate surroundings, all which does not concern us directly. What is to the point is that, after the change had been brought about, the administration in Golkoṇḍa under the Brahman ministers made an effort to introduce a more vigorous administration within the limits of the territory of Golkoṇḍa conquered from the empire of Vijayanagar. This seems more or less to synchronise with the march of Shivaji to the south, at any rate the proposal therefore, so far as the Golkoṇḍa government was concerned. Whether the change was brought about as a normal consequence of the change of ministry, or whether it had anything whatever to do with the agreement between Golkoṇḍa and Shivaji, does not appear clearly. The Company's people complained bitterly of the Brahman administration being very exacting, and the demands of the Tarafdār of Poonamallee particularly irksome. The Company's officials at Fort St. George cannot be regarded as altogether unprejudiced witnesses to what took place

about them, and all that they say regarding the government of Golkoṇḍa at the time perhaps could not be taken at their full value. It is in this state of affairs that Shivaji started on his southern campaign, and in the sources accessible to us we hear nothing of his doings in a military way in the territory of Golkoṇḍa. We get reports of his achievements only when he got actually into the territory of Bijapur. It seems therefore that Shivaji did nothing worth mentioning in the territory which ostensibly belonged to Golkoṇḍa, and it is only when he passed that territory and came into the region dependent upon Ginjee outside the sphere of Golkoṇḍa, that he began his activities one way and another.

So far as his operations in the territory dependent upon Ginjee were concerned, they seem to have been thorough-going, as was anticipated. The government of Ginjee itself seems to have become effete and fell an easy prey to the attacks of Shivaji, as Martin's Memoirs and other sources seem clearly to indicate. Ginjee was mastered possession of, it may be by a stratagem, as is generaly believed, Shivaji asking the governors, the sons of the Khan-i-Khanan at Bijapur for an interview, making prisoners of them and taking possession of Ginjee. From there he continued his attacks upon Sher Khan, who was governor of the territory south of that with a strong position at Tiruvadi. But Sher Khan was in no condition to meet the attacks of Shivaji on any terms of equality. He was easily driven off from Tiruvadi and from Buvanagiripaṭṭanam into the forests of Ariyalūr on the northern banks of the Coleroon. It was only Vellore that offered stout resistance and stood a siege of fourteen months. Abdullah Khan the governor gave it

up as hopeless at the end of the period, and stipulated for a provision for himself when he surrendered the fort. This provision is sometimes represented as a bribe offered by Shivaji, which is hardly the only possible inference in the circumstances. Then it is that Shivaji got into diplomatic transactions with his brother which proved far more unsatisfactory than perhaps he anticipated.

Shivaji's main object seems to have been to get his sovereign rights recognised in the southern territory as successor to his father, his brother Ekoji playing the subordinate political role of a feudatory to his brother. As a matter of fact, Tanjore, and the other places dependent upon Ginjee, were conquests that Shahji made for Bijapur; and so long as Shahji lived, they were counted as a part of his *jāghīr*, which he administrated in behalf of Bijapur. When Shahji died, the Bijapur government seems to have conferred the Nāyakship of Tanjore on Ekoji. In the circumstances it looked rather strange that Shivaji should have been particularly oblivious of recent history to have made the demand of his brother. The demand must have had an inner motive, and not merely the almost untenable position of asking his brother to recognise what was perhaps not exactly the actual position. Shivaji's demand amounted to a share of what belonged to his father, and, so far as the movable properties went, Ekoji made no difficulties. The irreconcilable difference between the brothers was in regard to the territory of Tanjore. Shivaji's position was not exactly that of grabbing for territory. He seems to have been anxious to get the supreme title to himself, while he seems to have been quite prepared to let his brother

conduct the administration, perhaps under the safeguard that he was in good hands for carrying on the administration. Notwithstanding all that is usually said about the bad administration of the Mahratta ruler of Tanjore, one of the Jesuit letters* makes it abundantly clear that the early years of Mahratta rule in Tanjore were years in which the administration exerted itself to bring about the prosperity of the country with great success. That was the period of administration under Raghunātha Nārāyan Hanumante, who is exhibited as an arch mischief-maker in the whole transaction. It is perhaps after he went away that the administration suffered a certain amount of neglect. Shivaji's motives might have been partially the restoration of good administration under Raghunāth Nārāyan Hanumante; at the same time we cannot altogether neglect the fact that the territory under the control of Shivaji was a comparatively extensive territory fast passing out of the hands of Bijapur. If ultimately it should be that Bijapur lost it, it would be much better that he had a title to it, so that whatever befell his territory in the north, he could claim to a position higher than that of a mere feudatory chieftain that he actually was in the Mahratta country. So he strained every nerve to get his brother to agree to his suggestion that Shivaji may be recognised as Shahji's successor to the title, and, when Ekoji would not agree to it, Shivaji offered him terms which limited his government in the south if ultimately he should insist upon continuing there; but offered an equivalent in the Mahratta country itself by preference.

* *Nāyaks of Madura*, p. 280, Letter of 1676 *cf.* also Martin in Dr. Sen's Translation, p. 341. Foreign Biographies of Sivaji.

The whole of this transaction does not directly concern the administration of Madanna and Akkanna, and the territories of Golkoṇḍa. They are of concern to this extent; that one of the terms of the treaty consisted of a promise by Shivaji to restore to Golkoṇḍa such conquests as he might make of territories which once belonged to the Nawab of Golkoṇḍa. It is just possible that there were bits of territory dependent upon Vellore which came into this category, and which Shivaji would have had to make over to Golkoṇḍa. We have not come upon any record in which this point is at issue between Golkoṇḍa and Shivaji. The whole arrangement made about the year 1676 by the new administration of Golkoṇḍa for the carrying on of the government of the territory on this side of Golkoṇḍa seems to have had that point in view. There is a reference in Martin's Memoirs that Golkoṇḍa wrote to the agency at Fort St. George not to render any assistance to Shivaji in his transactions round Ginjee. But the available records at Fort St. George do not throw any very particular light upon it, and Shivaji does not appear to have interfered with the complicated transactions that took place between the English, French, and the Dutch round Mylapore, or in what each one of these parties attempted to get from Golkoṇḍa by way of advantage from the fall of Mylapore to the French and its ultimate recapture by the Dutch and the Golkoṇḍa forces together. We have therefore to assume that, so far as these transactions went, Shivaji committed no breach of the agreement with the Golkoṇḍa government. In his conquests in the territory up the plateau in the region of Mysore, it is just possible that he trenched upon Golkoṇḍa territory. We have it on record in the Company's

correspondence that Podili Lingaunna, the Tarafdār of Poonamallee at the time had become the governor of the Karnāṭak in succession to Akkanna, and thus occupied a position corresponding to that of Mir Jumla or Musa Khan or Muhammad Ibrahim in regard to this. He claims having taken the town of Chikkanāyakanahalli* from the Bijapur territory probably belonging to the province of Sira. That happens to be after the death of Shivaji, and probably he took the place from the Mahrattas, thereby indicating clearly that so far as Podili Linganna was concerned, he exerted himself to discharge his duties faithfully to the state of Golkoṇḍa. His struggle throughout, during the administration of Fort St. George by Sir Streyensham Master, was again a struggle for the assertion of the authority of Golkoṇḍa over Fort St. George, and incidentally, of course, of bringing Madras into the sphere of his own official authority first as Tarafdār of Poonamallee, perhaps more clearly afterwards, when he became actual ruler of the whole of Golkoṇḍa Karnāṭak. He was dogged in his demands, and Master adopted high-handed measures as counter-strokes, and the position of the Company at Fort St. George became really uncomfortable. In regard to the demands of Lingappa, the rights of the question were not altogether all of them on one side, and they got complicated by the steps and countersteps adopted, and on the whole, it cannot well be said that Lingappa was doing anything that was not in the interest of the Golkoṇḍa administration. We come across remarks in the Company's

---

* Letter dated October 27, 1682, from Vīrarāghavayya at Golkoṇḍa p. 113. Letter to Fort St. George, Vol. ii, 1682.

records, perhaps more often in Martin's Memoirs,* of the stiffening character of the Brahman administration on the one hand and the demand for *peishcush* on the other, and it is an illuminating commentary that the Brahman agent in Golkoṇḍa, Venkaṭapati, himself a Brahman makes a remark that the Golkoṇḍa officials being Brahmans put out their hands whenever something had to be done.† This statement of the Brahman notwithstanding, the question of *peishcush* was a thing, which, at the time, does not appear to have been the peculiar characteristic of this class or that. The very English East India Company was prepared to offer it, and actually volunteered when Shivaji wanted certain things for which he offered to pay. The Council under Sir William Langhorn solemnly laid down once and again that it would be ridiculous to accept a price for those things supplied to Shivaji notwithstanding the offer of payment, because he was a great man and great advantages might accrue from this consideration. In the circumstances, it would not do to hurl it in the teeth of a particular historical character of the period as if it were a vice peculiar to him.

In regard to the Quṭub Shah Abul Hasan himself, he seems to have begun his administration more or less as a vigorous ruler. At one time, he was on a tour through his territory accompanied by Madanna.‡ The Company's records contain a reference to his anticipated visit to Masulipatam and the details as to how exactly to receive him and what presents to make. Another time a reference

---

* Letter to Fort St, George, Vol. ii, 1682, p, 335.

† Letter dated March 3, 1681–82, from Virarāghavayya. *Ibid.*, p. 22.

‡ Fort St. George: Diary and Consultations, November 21, 1674.

is made to the Dewan Madanna being away with the Nawab on business connected with the administration.* There is a record of date July 16, 1675 O.C. No. 4100 quoted in Love's *Vestiges of Old Madras* (*Ibid.*. p. 356) where the Quṭub Shah is said for the first time to have given up all his power to the ministry. It is a general remark and no details are given, and it may be that perhaps he did not concede all that he was asked to, while it is just possible that the administration had actually passed into the hands of the ministers. Even granting that the Company obtained the information from their agent in Golkoṇḍa, what really lies behind the remark is the influential position of the Tarafdār and the extraordinary difficulty experienced in getting what the company wanted from the Dewan. The records make it clear that in the first instance the factory at Fort St. George wanted to regard themselves as absolutely out of the control of the Tarafdār of Poonamallee, and again taking advantage of the relations between the Tarafdār and the Dewan and his brother, the agent, they sometimes made an appeal even to the Sultan direct, through others such as the Sar-i-Khel, Muhammad Ibrahim. The Company did not get their way, and it would naturally lead to the inference, justifiable from their point of view, that the Sultan had completely neglected the administration, and it was the ministers that were actually carrying it on.

The next important transaction with which Madanna's name is preeminently associated is the series of transactions between the Mughals on the one side, Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa

* Fort St. George : Diary and Consultations, April 10, 1679.

on the other, while yet Shivaji was in his southern invasion. This has reference to the campaign carried on against Bijapur by Bahadur Khan, the Mughal viceroy. Bijapur was under the regency of Bulol Khan, the Afghan, who had the sympathy of Diler Khan, the Mughal general. Bahadur Khan gave shelter to the Dakhanis, who suffered at the hands of the Afghan party under Bulol Khan in Bijapur, and in support of the Dakhani party he persisted in attacking Bijapur. This attack of Bahadur Khan fared very badly, and it was with great difficulty that Bahadur Khan could extricate himself from the position. He therefore turned to the south-east and laid siege to the twon of Akalkot and Naldrug. Here again the Bijapuris under Bulol Khan inflicted a heavy defeat and forced Bahadur Khan to raise the siege. The position of Bahadur Khan became critical when an army from Golkoṇḍa marched under Madanna Pandit himself to reinforce the Bijapuris. Bahadur Khan managed to buy off the Golkoṇḍa forces, and collecting together all his own resources and the Dakhani generals from Bijapur, he made even an attempt at securing the friendship of Shivaji. This demonstration in power brought Bulol Khan fear the consequences, and he agreed to let the Mughals conquer the exposed parts of the Bijapur territory in the north. Bahadur Khan was able to take Naldrug now in May 1677, and early in July following Gulburga as well. But these successes came too late for him. Aurangzeb already displeased with his failure in diplomacy with Shivaji, recalled him, because of the reverses he suffered at the hands of Bijapur egged on to that end by Diler Khan in combination with Bulol Khan, the Bijapur regent and friend of Diler

Khan. The emperor felt so far persuaded against Bahadur Khan, as not only to recall him, but also to give the command to Diler Khan. Bulol Khan, the regent in his attempt to bring about this culmination offered to conquer Hyderabad and to crush Shivaji if only the emperor would be pleased to order the imperial troops to assist him. Aurangzeb agreed, and Diler Khan and Bulol Khan together arranged to invade Golkoṇḍa territories late in 1677. Bahadur Khan left the Dakhan in September 1677. The Wazir, Asad Khan, who was sent by the emperor to put matters right in the Dakhan, returned very soon to the emperor's side, and Diler Khan, at the command of forces in the Dakhan, continued operations initiated by Bahadur Khan which resulted in the acquisition of a vast tract of land enclosed by a line drawn from the river Bhima and the Manjera to Bider and Gulburga, turning southwards towards Halsangi, not very far from Bijapur. On the south-eastern side, the frontiers came into touch with the important fortresses of Golkoṇḍa on that side particularly Malkhed. Neither the successes of Bahadur Khan, nor the alliance of Diler Khan with Bulol Khan of Bijapur, brought the Mughals any nearer to possession of Bijapur, which was the object that the emperor set his heart upon. In accordance with the terms made by Bulol Khan, a joint attack was made upon Malkhed. While Bahadur Khan himself had been laying siege to Gulburga in June 1677, the Quṭub Shah massed his forces on the western frontier under the commander-in-chief, Muhammad Ibrahim, merely to watch the frontier and not to enter into the war. When Gulburga fell Golkoṇḍa was threatened with attack unless the Quṭub Shah delivered up to the Mughals Shivaji and Shaik

Minhaj, the Dakhani general of Bijapur, who had taken service with him. The negotiations* developed ultimately into a demand for a crore of rupees and ten thousand horse as a fine for Golkoṇḍa having assisted Shivaji. Golkoṇḍa offered to pay five lakhs of rupees and no more. But Diler Khan and Bulol Khan made up their minds to attack Malkhed in reply. After various incidents, the Golkoṇḍa forces got the better of it ultimately as the combined forces of the Mughals and Bijapur were pressed hard in the course of the war. Diler Khan therefore solicited peace as his friend Bulol Khan was in his death-bed. In the meanwhile, Golkoṇḍa's intervention was sought by Siddi Masaud and other nobles still faithful to the house of the Adil Shah. Abul Hasan Kuṭub Shah's intervention brought the different parties in Bijapur to agree to the following terms. Bulol Khan was to resign the regency, Siddi- Masaud succeeding him. Six lakhs of rupees, the arrears of pay due to the Afghan soldiers, should be paid by Masaud and the forces disbanded on condition that these forces quitted Bijapur. Bulol Khan was to retire to his own fief. The Quṭub Shah agreed to see that the Bijapur territory was not attacked for the future, and a Golkoṇḍa agent was to be stationed in Bijapur, whose advice was to be taken in regard to the administration of affairs. Akkanna, the brother of Madanna, was chosen for this post. At the same time, Masaud met the Mughal general Diler Khan at Gulburga, and agreed in return for the Wazirship of Bijapur to take orders from the emperor Aurangzeb, and not to make any alliance with Shivaji, but rather to help the Mughals in their attempt to

* Martin p. 331.

take from him the Mahratta territory. The Adil Shah's sister Padsha Bibi was to marry a son of the Mughal emperor. On the face of it, Masaud had put himself in an ambiguous position. Bulol Khan died in December 1677, and Masaud entered on his regency. His first difficulty was the disbanding of the Afghan soldiery in Bijapur that he undertook to depending upon a promise of Golkoṇḍa to find the money. The Quṭub Shah delayed payment, and the Afghan troops of Bulol Khan went into mutiny, and life became impossible almost in Bijapur. Masaud's power was of the slightest even inside the capital. In this desperate position, he alienated the sympathy of the Mughals by attempting to get into a secret alliance with Shivaji. The disorders encouraged the activities of Shivaji on his side, and, notwithstanding the protests of Diler Khan, Masaud invited Shivaji to help him out of his difficulties in Bijapur. Masaud brought upon himself the troubles that he attempted to avoid. The terms of the treaty with Diler Khan were a negation of the obligations that he undertook to dischar geto Golkoṇḍa, and naturally Golkoṇḍa refused to put him in resources for disbanding the Afghan soldiery. Their mutiny almost paralysed the administration of Bijapur, and drove the regent into the arms of Shivaji as the only means of safety. This alliance with the Mahratta made the Mughal general hostile. So the hostility of the Mughal general on one side and the coolness on the side of Golkoṇḍa put Masaud completely at the mercy of Shivaji. Shivaji made an effort to render the assistance that was asked, but even there what the regent did was hardly what was to have been expected of an ally. Shivaj's troops were looked upon with suspicion. After making an effective diversion against Shivaji, Diler

Khan found out the shiftiness of Masaud's policy; and not only withheld further assistance, but felt even compelled to attack the Adil Shahi territory again. With the internal disturbance brought on by misunderstandings between the regent and Sharza Khan, affairs in Bijapur were in such utter confusion that nothing could be done against the advancing Mughals. Shivaji, having been looked upon with suspicion, the Mughal general thrown into opposition by the attempted alliance with Shivaji, affairs in Bijapur itself being in a hopeless condition, Bijapur was at the mercy of Diler Khan. Diler Khan wanted to take possession of Bijapur by a *coup*. Information of it somehow leaked out, and those in Bijapur whom he wished to capture had time to escape, and Diler Khan's attempt proved abortive. He was driven to the alternative of bribing Bijapur troops and nobles to betray the interests of Bijapur rather more successfully. Masaud had no alternative but to agree to what terms Diler Khan demanded, and among them was the proposed marriage of the Bijapur princess Padishah Bibi, who by a voluntary act of hers left the city of her birth to become two years afterwards the wife of prince Azam, son of Aurangzeb. Not satisfied with this surrender, Diler Khan demanded the resignation by Masaud of his regency. A war became inevitable, and Diler Khan had to carry on the war under very disadvantageous circumstances as the viceroy. Shah Alam was very far from friendly to him. Diler Khan's operations therefore delayed, Masaud was just able to provision the fort and put in such troops as he still had command of into the fort. He had no alternative but to appeal to Shivaji, who rendered prompt and effective assistance. Masaud utilised this and the disadvantages under

which Diler Khan laboured to gain time, so that Shivaji might have the chance of crippling the Mughal power. Shivaji succeeded in raiding the Mughal territory so effectively that Diler Khan's ruin became certain, as complaints were constantly reaching the prince-viceroy in regard to the destructive activity of Shivaji's forces, and the incapacity of the Mughal general to render effective assistance. Diler Khan's trump card in these operations happened to be the person of Sambaji, son of Shivaji in camp. He had run away from his father at the end of the previous year and was well received by the Mughal general in whose camp he happened to be. But in the midst of these troubles, he managed to escape first to Bijapur and ultimately to Panhala, early in December 1679.

With the return of Sambaji the position of Shivaji had improved much. He had rendered valuable and effective assistance to Bijapur, and had been the means of saving Bijapur for the time being. This would be a very good set-off for all that he may have done against Bijapur, although ostensibly he was still on terms with them as before. Diler Khan's position had been terribly damaged. His efforts to take Bijapur ended in failure. The advantage of having Sambaji in his camp which he regarded as a trump card had been lost; his operations against Golkoṇḍa so far had been only futile, and all this was cause enough to give the emperor the greatest dissatisfaction. The emperor was getting himself involved in a very difficult struggle against the Rajputs of Chitoor and Udaipur: but for this, he might have shown his anger more decisively. What the emperor actually did, however, was to call

back Shah Alam the viceroy and Diler Khan the general, and send in their stead minister Khan-i-Jahan to rehabilitate the Mughal position in the Dakhan. The net result of the operations so far had been the promise of subordination that Shah Alam got from the Bijapur authorities to the Emperor. Otherwise things had gone wrong all round. The operations that Shivaji began as a counter-stroke to the attack on Bijapur by the Mughals by carrying depredations into the Mughal territory and distracting their attention, still continued and put an end to their authority all along the whole frontier from Burhanpur in the north to the territory immediately round Sholapur in the south. While they were being reduced to stalemate like this, occurred the death of Shivaji and the accession of Sambhuji to power. The disturbance immediately following Sambhuji's accession to the throne kept the Mahratta trouble under control, and gave a certain amount of respite to the Mughal Wazir to bring the whole Mughal Dakhan into some kind of order and give to the subjects of those territories some peace and security which they badly needed. In the meanwhile occurred the rebellion of prince Akbar who set himself up against his father; proclaiming himself emperor, he had dethroned the old great Mughal by proclamation, and had put himself under the protection of Sambaji. The Mughal resources had to be turned to this new danger and a campaign had to be undertaken against Sambaji, and prince Akbar. This dragged on for a while till the Emperor himself brought to a close his campaign in Rajputana, and was able to arrive in the Dakhan and take command of the operations about the end of the year 1681. His presence in the Dakhan changed the whole aspect of

affairs, and Mughal armies ware sent into the Konkan and into the southern Mahratta country against Sambaji. But Sambaji showed himself in this campaign a worthy son of Shivaji, and kept the whole Mughal army at bay. The campaign dragged on for two years like this and it was only the application of all the Mughal resources that brought the Mahrattas to bay and finished this campaign successfully.

The Emperor could turn his attention to Bijapur which in his opinion was responsible for the Mahratta trouble. The best way to get rid of the Mahratta power was by concentrating all Mughal forces against them. So the various divisions of the Mughal army were called to headquarters, and were sent down to attack each its own particular portion of the Mahratta frontier. Sambaji was at that time occupied in a struggle against the Portuguese, and the opportunity for this onslaught was well chosen as the Mahratta feudatories were getting gradually discontented against the rule of Sambaji, and several chieftains of note were ready to adopt a policy of defection to which they were incited by agents of the Great Mughal. Notwithstanding this Sambaji was able to carry on for a considerably long time; but gradually he had to give way before the operations under the command of the Emperor himself. At the end of 1684 the Mughal outposts were pushed in along the frontier and the Mahrattas were brought under control in a way. Then the Mughals hurled themselves against Bijapur as getting rid of Bijapur and annexing it to the Mughal territory would weaken the Mahrattas very considerably. The Emperor discovered that Bijapur was still playing into the hands of the Mahrattas, and rather than

overcome the Mahrattas and attack Bijapur, it seemed to him better to get rid of Bijapur first. One way of starving the Mahrattas it appeared to the Emperor, was to destroy Bijapur and annex it to the Mughal dominions. The operations against Bijapur began actively about the end of 1683, and the war dragged on, along with the operations against the Mahrattas, throughout 1684, and the siege of Bijapur really began in 1685. The Bijapuris put up as efficient a defence of the fortress against the Mughal attack as they possibly could this time, and ultimately the Emperor had to change the original arrangements and to draw himself closer to the scene of operations. He removed his headquarters to Sholapur where he remained during the siege. The Adil Shah in turn received assistance from Siddhi Masaud from distant Kurnool, the Golkoṇḍa forces arrived from Hyderabad under Ambaji Pandit, and Sambaji himself sent an army corps under Hambir Rao, At this stage of the operations the Emperor in spite of all his efforts found the Quṭub Shahis joining forces with Bijapur. The Emperor wanted Abul Hasan not to help the Adil Shah in any way. But Abul Hasan responded to Adil Shah's appeal in July 1684, and adopted, under the advice of Madanna, the wise policy of standing side by side with the Dakhani powers as against the common enemy. The Emperor found it necessary to divide his forces and send Shah Alam and Khan-i-Jahan to attack Hyderabad. The Mughal siege of Bijapur continued, Bijapur having various successes.

The grand army having been long in occupation of the territory of Bijapur all round, famine threatened the camp; supplies could not come with regularity from the north;

communications were closed. Prince Azam was in great straits to carry on the operations successfully, and it became a question whether the siege operations were to be continued or given up. The emperor responded to his appeal and sent supplies and reinforcements in time. Simultaneously success attended the operations of Shah Alam against Hyderabad. He was able to enter Golkoṇḍa and the murder of the minister Madanna drove Abul Hasan to shut himself up in Golkoṇḍa. In March 1686, the emperor shifted his headquarters to very near Bijapur itself, and ultimately Bijapur fell on September 12, 1686, after a siege of very near two years. A week after Aurangzeb himself entered the fort and Bijapur became a Mughal possession.

After the fall of Bijapur the days of Golkoṇḍa existing as an independent state could not be many. But before coming to the fall of Golkoṇḍa we shall have to note the salient features of its history and mark the evolution of its policy which brought about its downfall. We have already noted the part that Golkoṇḍa played in regard to the kingdom of Bijapur in the immediate neighbourhood, and the Mahratta state under Sambaji. The policy adopted was one of alliance with the Dakhan rulers as against their common enemy the Mughal. This alliance continued unbroken up to the death of Shivaji notwithstanding the fact that after 1677 the relation between Shivaji and Golkoṇḍa was not perhaps as cordial as before because of differences in regard to Shivaji's conquests in the Karnatic. The general policy pursued by Golkoṇḍa was perhaps the only sound one at the time and in the particular circumstances, namely pursuing a common policy with Bijapur and the Mahrattas as against the

Mughals, if the independence of this southern kingdom from the Mughal empire was at all a worthy ambition. The Quṭub Shahi kingdom was not protected by a natural frontier against the Mughals in the north. It was the same case with the Bijapur kingdom to a considerable extent. The only question to consider in regard to this policy is not whether it was right or wise, but whether it was possible and whether the Quṭub Shah's resources were such as to make an effective stand against Mughal attack. The weakness of the policy consisted in the impossibility of the three states co-operating and adopting consistently a common policy. Aurangzeb hardly wanted a cause for war. But he wanted a suitable opportunity when he could attack these kingdoms and annex them successfully. If Aurangzeb was kept from annexing these kingdoms, it is not want of will, but much rather the facility to do so. Sir Jadunath Sarkar tells a story that Mirza Mohammad, the Mughal envoy in Abul Hasan's court, one day took the Quṭub Shah to task by making the remark 'it does not become you to assume the title of the emperor. If Aurangzeb hears of it, he will become more angry.' The Quṭub Shah replied promptly 'you chide me by mistake. If we are not called Padishahs how can Aurangzeb be styled the Padishah of Padishahs.' This gives an idea of what the Mughal policy was towards Golkoṇḍa. 'Resigning his royal position to his Wazir, Madanna, he shut himself up into his palace with an army of concubines and dancing girls.'* Whether this character given to Abul Hasan is

* The same learned historian relates 'From the thoughts of these humiliations and the impending ruin of his house, Abul Hasan, like Wajid Ali Shah, sought distraction or oblivion by plunging into unrelieved sensuality.' (Fryer, Vol. i. p. 85).

historically sound we shall consider a little later. But in the meanwhile what we have to consider is the more important sequence of historical incidents which would give an idea of what the administration of the state of Golkoṇḍa was during the period. We have noticed already that Abul Hasan actively pursued the policy of Madanna of assisting Bijapur as against Mughal attacks. Abul Hasan and Madanna were responsible for pursuing an active military policy along the Mughal frontier of their dominions, and beating back more than one Mughal invasion. They came to a definite agreement with the Adil Shahi kingdom, and assured themselves of the adoption of a similar sound policy by that state by even appointing a resident in Bijapur in the person of Akkanna as was already stated. During the period (1674–79) of five years we hear already that Abul Hasan and Madanna were making a tour in the course of the administration of affairs. The first which refers to about 1673–74 was delayed, but it was undertaken some time in 1675. On another tour Abul Hasan and Madanna were reported to have been residing in Bezwada early in 1679 according to the reports to the Company at Fort St. George. This is referred to by Martin in his Memoirs. That does not look exactly like confining himself to his palace, and fuddling himself with wine and women.* The Mughal historians and those historians who wrote about these states from outside have little to say of Golkoṇḍa or Bijapur when they did not come into contact with the Mughals. The period 1668–86 was a period when these complications of operations demanding concentrated attention upon the Mahratta country put

* D and C. Letter of 29th February 1675-6; also 22nd April 1679. Letter from Fort Saint George, 6th February 1678-9.

perhaps Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa outside the horizon of those histriographers who wrote about the history of operations of the Mughals. But what we are able to gather of this period from the information that is available from the records of Fort St. George gives us an entirely different idea. We have referred already to one feature that a couple of tours were undertaken by Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah ; but the facts of history come to us in an entirely different light from the records. These are generally found in letters written by a Brahman who was in residence at Golkoṇḍa to transact business for the British Company in Fort St George. There were similar agents of other Companies such as the Dutch. These people kept sending news of what was taking place at Golkoṇḍa. These Companies themselves had to transact items of business of varying importance from time to time. The Brahman ministers of Golkoṇḍa, Madanna and Akkanna, appear in these British records in a light which is entirely different from that which one would infer from extracts given above. The Company's servants no doubt complain of the exacting character of the Brahman ministers ; but when the actual exactions get to be analysed it is found that it is nothing more than enforcing strictly the incidences of the administration coupled of course with what these people generally called *sallabad*, the *māmūl* of modern times, in regard to presents which were bribes and nothing less. The Company's agents in Fort St. George were struggling might and main to get their possession of Fort St. George out of the official control of the local ruler for the time being, namely, the Tarafdār of Poonamallee within whose territory lay the town of Madras.* The Tarafdār was more than

* D and C. Letter December 1676 and 20th idem.

equal to these and held fast to his official right, and pointed out to the government that, even to the Company, the carrying on of this administration efficiently would be impossible unless the headquarters transacted business with the Company's agent at Madras through him. This Tarafdār was no other than Podili Linganna one of the nephews of Madanna. Another of their nephews was the Tahsildar of Bhadrachalam by name Gopanna who is better known perhaps to tradition in his new devotional name Rāmdās. Another nephew of theirs rendered distinguished service as a military man and is known by the title Rustam Rao. Madanna kept his position as chief minister; Akkanna began by occupying the position of the controller of the forces, and had been at one time described as commissioner of the south who had been in a progress of pilgrimage and inspection to the south when he visited Tirupati and Kāḷahasti not far from each other, and quite close to Madras.* Akkanna advanced from that position to that of the Golkoṇḍa Resident in Bijapur, and later on, he seems to have held for a while the position occupied by Mir Jumla of the governorship of the entire Golkoṇḍa Karnatic. But after 1682 he was occupying a post of great importance at court because we hear of Podili Linganna being promoted to that position, the position held by Neknam Khan who was one of the successors of Mir Jumla. While one does not see very much of Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah's work directly in what appears in this correspondence, one is able to see clearly that the administration was carried on with efficiency. The Company's agents did complain about the *Tashriffs* and demands at various time for

* D and C. Letter 27th March 1681; 4th April 1681 and 15th idem.

various amounts of presents. They did not complain of things not being done. Privileges were demanded, and bribes were offered in proportion to the value of those privileges. It was not always possible to secure the privileges demanded even at the price. One would interpret this as a sign of efficiency rather than that of inefficiency; but that Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah was not a cypher in the administration is clear from the fact that some of the agents of the Company could appeal to him and get things done. Of course that happened only occasionally, and always through other high-placed men of the court such as the Sar-i-Khel Ibrahim through whom, for a certain period of time, the Company's agents of Fort St. George were paying their annual rent of 1,200 pagodas.* The matters of contention between Podili Linganna and the Company generally were in regard to the rising in commercial position of Fort St. George through various causes, and particularly the deprivation of the customs revenue of the state of Golkoṇḍa which was past passing to Fort St. George even to the detriment of the harbours in the immediate neighbourhood such as Mylapore.† This spelt the complete ruin of the customs revenue of Golkoṇḍa, and meant necessarily the increase of the customs revenue of Fort St. George to that extent and perhaps more. Then again it was another point that Linganna could never forget or forgive, that Fort St. George should pay its rent only through him, and should have no transactions directly with the king and his ministers at Golkoṇḍa. He often complained to the headquarters,

* D and C. Letter December 1676.

† D and C. Letter 29th February 1675-6.

and often succeeded in getting the headquarters to agree with him. There is a letter written by Akkanna to the agents of Fort St. George that Linganna had power to transact business, and that the Company's agents would be wise if they did their business through him, as he had the power.* To some considerable extent it seems to have been recognised in the days of Sir William Langhorn and when Gyfford assumed the agency. In the interim however, when Sir Streyensham Master held the agency, things went to an unpleasant extent. Linganna was inexorable in enforcing his official rights. Master was equally tenacious and went the lengh of adopting high-handed measures to enforce what he deemed to be his rights. But these were nothing short of coercive measures put upon the subjects of Golkoṇḍa and would have been sufficient cause for war.† Master notes in his Diary that minister Madanna and his master Abdul Hasan Quṭub Shah were in Bezwada at one time, and even distant Madapollam at another time. He notes that at Madapollam a house built by an Englishman was looked upon as good enough by the Shah to be purchased for his use in case of need.‡ In regard to the time when the two visited Bezwada it is mentioned that both of them were there with a view to inspecting the locality and refortifying the stronghold of Koṇḍapalli to which they intended moving the treasures in case of need.§ This was some time about A.D. 1679 while Aurangzeb's attack had not

* Letters to Fort St. George: Ollampana's letter, June 1681; Akkanna's letter, 2nd October 1681.

† 22nd April 1679, p. 81.

‡ 10th April 1679, p. 96.

§ See † note above.

begun. In the light of these facts which should be regarded thoroughly historical, that Abul Hasan could be regarded exactly as Fryer describes him would be hazardous. The fact of Abul Hasan's offending the emperor are set down in the latter's own words.

'This luckless wretch (meaning Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah) has given the supreme power in his State to a *kafir*, and made Sayyids, Shaikhs and scholars subject to that man. He has publicly allowed (in his realm) all kinds of sin and vice ziz., taverns, brothels, and gambling houses. He himself is day and night sunk in the deadly sins, through his excessive devotion to drink, and fails to distinguish between Islam and infidelity, justice and oppression, sin and piety. By refusing to respect God's commands and prohibitions, by sending aid to infidel powers, and by promising one lakh of *hun* to the *kafir* Shambhu, he has made himself accursed before God and man.' (K. K. Vol. ii, p. 328.)

Analysed, it comes to this : Abul Hasan appointed a Hindu prime minister to conduct the administration. He has tolerated the Hindus and Hinduism without distinguishing between Islam and infidelity, justice and oppression, sin and piety. He assisted infidel powers like the Mahrattas, and was on terms of peace with Shivaji and his son Sambaji. These three sets of his acts were inexcusable in the eyes of the fanatic Emperor, and therefore of the orthodox historian.

We shall examine these separately. Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah was a man of humble origin, and was by chance elevated to his high destinies. He found the nobles of the

court not inclined to show him the respect that was due to his position—a feature not uncommon in Muhammadan history. He preferred therefore those that would be more loyal and deferential to him and his position. He appointed officials in the persons of the two brothers who brought hard work and efficiency to their work; who had risen to a position from which they could be elevated to the highest dignity in the state. If that is a crime, under Islamic law, Abul Hasan could quote illustrious precedents for it. The ultimate test is whether these men conducted themselves efficiently in the interests of the State, and in those of their master Abul Hasan. In regard to the first it is fairly clear that the policy they adopted in regard to it was probably the best in the circumstances, notwithstanding the ultimate adverse result. It was perhaps inevitable that ultimately these kingdoms should be absorbed in the Mughal Empire. About the result, the dictum of history is certainly not united in a chorus of praise. The civil administration seems to have been at least as efficient in this state as in those contemporaneous with that of Quṭub Shah including the Empire. Except for the personal hatred conceived, and a general dislike to the ministers carrying on a policy of rigorous retrenchment at the time, there is nothing on record against them as such. Even Sir Jadunath Sarkar notes down: 'Madanna very wisely advised him not to shut himself up in Golkoṇḍa but go to Warangal or some other distant fort so that, in the event of Golkoṇḍa being besieged by the Mughals, he would be free to move about to reinforce its defenders. But this advice only deepened the king's suspicion of his Wazir's sinister design as suggested by Shaikh Minhaj.' This relates to the

time when Aurangzeb succeeded in detaching Mirza Ibrahim from his loyalty to Quṭub Shah. As a result of this desertion, Abul Hasan shut himself up in the fort of Golkoṇḍa. This does not show Madanna at all in the light of a disloyal traitor to his master.

A desertion like that of Mirza Ibrahim at this critical juncture,* as of Mir Jumla on the previous occasion, gives adequate explanation why Abul Hasan on the first occasion the chance offered itself, appointed the Brahman brothers to the highest offices in the state. So long as Aurangzeb, or his agents were in the Dakhan and pursued the Dakhan policy inaugurated long before, the danger of defection of Muhammadan Officers was quite real. The chances of Brahman ministers deserting their ruler and joining the Padishah must have seemed to him unlikely, as in fact it was, not because Aurangzeb would not make the effort, but Aurangzeb was far from likely to have made himself acceptable to them. While Aurangzeb therefore may be regarded as quite right from his own point of view, in objecting to the Quṭub Shah's appointment of Brahman ministers, the Quṭub Shah could offer valid justification for the policy that he adopted in this matter. So neither the appointment of the Brahman ministers, nor the vesting of his confidence in them that Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah did, need be held to indicate weakness on the part of the Quṭub Shah.

Coming to the second point of his offending, which is more or less intimately connected with this, namely, of his placing the *kaffir* above the faithful, and conducting

* Letters to Fort St. George, 22nd March 1682 and 17th May 1682.

himself impartially as between the Islamic and alien faiths the Quṭub Shah may have to plead guilty to the fact, but perhaps, may plead in extenuation that it was a measure of more prudential policy as proved by the experience of his predecessors even. Before becoming the Quṭub Shah, Abul Hasan was of poor parentage and may have been thrown very much into the company of Hindus, and the Islamic Pir, in whose services he happened to be at the time, may have been a teacher of a more liberal form of the Islamic religion than perhaps the Emperor would have approved of. Whatever be the actual reason, in the surroundings in which Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah was placed, he probably felt that he ought, as far as may be, to hold the balance even as between his Hindu and Muhammadan subjects. We have no definite evidence of historical documents in regard to the pursuing of a liberal policy in religion like that; but there is a continuous living tradition in the story of Rāmdās and his misappropriation of public funds for the purpose of building a temple and otherwise providing for the requirements of the temple, to Śrī Rāma in Bhadrāchalam. When after long years of demand, the Quṭub Shah took actually coercive measures, the story has it that a miraculous payment of the sum was made, and a receipt obtained directly from the Quṭub Shah himself, by two men calling themselves Rāma and Lakshmaṇa, peons of the Bhadrāchalam *sircar*, who came overnight, paid the balance demanded in cash, and obtained a receipt then and there of the Padishah himself. The historian is not called upon to believe in the miracle or its occurrence. But the fact that the Tahsildar, a faithful servant of the government till before this, and influentially connected as

he was, should have allowed himself to be tortured severely all for the sake of his own faith in Śrī Rāma, may possibly have made an impression upon the Quṭub Shah, and, if that, should have happened early in his reign or even later, it migbt account partially for perhaps a more than usually liberal policy towards his Hindu subjects. Whatever it be, it does not appear to have been so unusual in the history of the Dakhani Sultanates that the Hindus enjoyed high official preferment under the various kingdoms during the first days of their existence, though generally the Muhammadans enjoyed more than their share of the loaves and fishes of office. As it is we have seen that apart from the two brothers, Madanna and Akkanna, three of their nephews occupied positions of importance, and one of them was advanced to as high a position as that of the distinguished Golkoṇḍa governors Mir Jumla and Neknam Khan; and this could not have been all through sheer favouritism. The tenacity with which this particular man fought for the financial advantages of the Golkoṇḍa government against the British Company at Fort St. George and its masterful agent Sir Streynsham Master, and the fact that he even distinguished himself in a military way by carrying on war against Sambaji's officers, and acquiring for Golkoṇḍa the possession of a place like Chikkanāyakanahalli in Mysore,* redound to his credit and ability no less than his loyalty. It was not unworthy favouritism that brought him up, nor that he was guilty of sacrificing the interests of the state to selfish end.

The third charge against Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah is the pursuing of a pro-Mahratta policy, the responsibility

* Letter to Fort St. George, 27th October 1682.

for which the historian assigns a good measure to the prime minister Madanna. Nothing succeeds like success; but success is not the only test of the soundness of a policy adopted under certain circumstances. In the circumstances in which Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah came to the throne, and, in the surroundings in which he was actually placed, there were only two courses open to him—either submitting himself to the Emperor and 'placing his neck under the yoke' in the language of the Islamic historians, and perhaps becoming one of the mansabadars of the empire,—in other words, bringing about the political extinction of the Golkoṇḍa state as such. The other is, so long as there was a chance, to bring the resources of the three states of South India together, and set a term to the advance of the Mughal power in the Dakhan. From the point of view of the Muhammadan Aurangzeb this would be a heinous crime, if for no other reason than this, namely, that it would assure the permanency of the Mahratta state in the condition in which it was, if not, give it a new lease of life. Subsequent history has amply demonstrated the unwisdom of the policy pursued by Aurangzeb as against the Mahrattas, and with no great success. This policy would bring no advantage, either for Bijapur or for Golkoṇḍa; but would amount to committing a political suicide and becoming merged in the empire, unless it be to put the Mahrattas in a position of disadvantage in the struggle against the advancing power of the Mughals. It was really to the interests of these Islamic states, their political interests, that the Mahratta state should not go out of existence, and the conditions of the problem made it certain that the previous destruction of the Mahrattas could only put off

the destruction of the Muhammadan power for a short while. The previous submission of the Islamic powers would put the Mahratta state at a considerable disadvantage and even immediate jeopardy. But it was not likely to have altered the course of history of the Mahratta struggle at the time. The policy adopted by Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah at the time of alliance with Shivaji and Bijapur was one which perhaps was best in the circumstances. If all the three pulled together and put forth their utmost resources and fought hard, the success of the imperial power would have been really difficult; and if they held it for a few years and old Aurangzeb passed away, they might have continued to exist as separate states.

If what is said above is justifiable historically, the part that the Brahman ministers played is one which ought to be held to redound to their honour, and to the loyalty with which they served the master who employed them. In the alliance with Shivaji, the part that Madanna played must have been one of smoothening the difficulties in the way and bringing about the alliance with far greater ease than perhaps would have happened otherwise. It is just possible that the minister, or the ministers, sympathised inwardly at any rate, with the ambition of Shivaji; but there is no hint in any of our sources that Shivaji cherished the ambition of annexing Golkoṇḍa to his dominions, and of the Golkoṇḍa ministers agreeing to a proposition like that. The worst that could be said is that, in allowing and actively assisting Shivaji to make his conquests of Bijapur Karnāṭak, Golkoṇḍa may have expected a share of the spoil. But in all accounts of the campaign there is no mention

that Shivaji carried on operations against any division which might be regarded as belonging to the Golkodṇa Karnāṭak. He seems to have confined himself entirely to what he might have regarded as the part of the Karnāṭak conquered, no doubt for Bijapur, by his father Shahji or his brother Ekoji. As a matter of fact, his operations were confined to the portions conquered by Shahji himself, and he had no thoughts of attempting any military operation against Tanjore. If it is found to be a part of the agreement that a share of these conquests should be given to Golkoṇḍa, that question would arise only when his conquests should be definitively regarded as his own. They were so far conquests that he made ostensibly under Bijapur, and, it might be said, held of them as firmly as other portions of the territory belonging to Bijapur held by him. So far as the position of the ministers was concerned there is nothing in this transaction that would compromise their loyalty to the state that they served. We have already indicated that in civil administration they carried it on with a little more of bureaucratic efficiency than before. For the bribery and corruption that may have prevailed, the times were responsible, and there is absolutely nothing to show that they were more corrupt than their contemporaries, officials and non-officials, Muhammadans and Hindus. It would be interesting to note in this connection what the French writer Martin has to say of the Brahman ministers in regard to the rigours of whose administration his complaint is as bitter as those of any other.

Referring to the Mughal demands before the invasion by Aurangzeb, Martin writes, 'The great lords of his court

perceiving the weakness of the government of the prince, and that he entrusted it entirely to the minister Madanna, who daily reduced their salaries, kept some understanding with the court of the Mughals. It is believed that it was by their advice that considerable sums were daily demanded with the object of having a pretext for attacking the kingdom if they were refused, or, if the money or a part of it was paid which would ruin and render the king incapable of raising troops when he would attack.' The administration had to be carried on under the gravest disadvantages possible. The army had to be maintained on a warfooting, and wars were of frequent occurrence and had to be carried on. This would necessitate considerable stringency in regard to money and the raising of revenue for the purposes of the state. A Brahman minister in an Islamic state would, under the best of circumstances, be unpopular; but where the administration was, under imperious necessity, to adopt measures of retrenchment, the minister chiefly responsible for it should necessarily become unpopular. Certainly he seems to have been unpopular with the Muhammadan nobles and officials at the court; but the ordinary people seem to have regarded him with reverence as the extract from the Dutch journal *Havart* pointed out. People seem to have respected him and exhibited considerable regard. Even that journal *Havart* says 'Madanna was well versed in Persian, Hindustani and the vernaculars of the country, and lived in a kingly style; as the golden palanquin in which he went out in the streets appeared, people showed their respect by stopping on the way. He was very kind to the Dutch.' That popular respect could not have been obtained without some justification in the administration, at any rate

having done them some good. The source of information for this Dutch journal, whatever that be, was anything but favourable to the ministers, as we shall have to note hereafter. But it will suffice here to say that even this hostile witness had to state it that Madanna enjoyed a measure of popular respect, while he was undoubtedly in the last years of his rule unpopular with Muhammadans of position. Speaking of the Brahman administration generally, the following remarks of Martin seem to the point: 'A party of Reddis, these are people who keep most of their lands, withdrew to the woods because Shivaji's officers did not observe the conditions of their treaties with them. There was a general disorder in the province and (this was always) caused by the Brahmans. They also wanted to cause us some damage at the commencement of the month of September. On the pretext of getting measured (surveyed) a garden that we had outside the lodge, the residences of our married Frenchmen who were in the colony and the houses of the people of the country who were in the Company's service and to enforce a tax upon (us). I strongly opposed it.' These remarks have reference to the neighbourhood of Pondicherry in the province of Ginjee. It was a new conquest, and it was Raghunāth Pant and his officials who were trying to introduce an orderly administration, which certainly must have caused considerable dissatisfaction, legitimate as well as other than legitimate. That the dissatisfaction could be other than legitimate is clear from the instances given by Martin himself. It is not obvious why the garden occupied by them should not be measured like other lands, and why this land should not be put under the usual kind of revenue.

This kind of dissatisfaction naturally would be given in a fairly large number of cases, and that was the kind of dissatisfaction that one hears of generally from the records of the foreigners. But, be it said to the credit of Martin, that unlike the average of them he is more discriminating even where he has something to say directly concerning the administration of Raghunāth Pant. He says in a passage regarding a conversation that the French Brahman agent had with Ragarnat Pandit (Raghunāth Pant). The Governor-General of the province Raghunāth Pandit said to have complained strongly that the French carried on no commerce and brought in no revenue to the state, and if anything, they were disadvantageous to the state inasmuch as the Dutch who were carrying on trade and were paying revenue, had to abandon their factory because of the presence of the French. Raghunāth Pant offered to wait for another year or two to give them time before he took any measures to eject them from the country; but in the meanwhile he demanded a certain sum of money which he badly needed to carry on the administration, when the agent explained to him that the French had no money, that they would be quite willing to leave the place as soon as they should have facility to do so. Martin notes that Raghunāth Pant was actually set up against the French, and the unsatisfactry treatment of the French by him was due to that. And then he proceeds to note, 'It is true that the Governor-General lacked money for paying the troops, but that proceeded from two causes; the first (was) that the Brahmans from the highest officer to the lowest robbed with impunity; the second reason (was) the ill-treatment accorded to the people which drove many to leave and pass on to the

territory of neighbouring princes ; so that the province did not yield two thirds of its ordinary revenue. It must, however, be admitted that the Brahmans were more careful in making the lands profitable than those under the government of the Muhammadans had appeared to us to be. A number of places around Pondicherry covered with brambles and brushwood only, of which nobody thought (anything), was reclaimed and these have produced since, but the best part of these improvements went to the profit of the Brahmans.' While appraising the value of the evidence of even a man like Martin, we have to make a distinction beween that which appears on the surface and visible to the on-looker, and that which is a little more recondite. In this passage while one may readily accept what he has to say regarding the ill-treatment of the inhabitants and the better character of the cultivation, etc., one might well question how far his remarks regarding the misappropriation of the revenue would be valid. The government of Shivaji, by all accounts, was careful in regard to this particular, and in arranging for the orderly administration and the collection of a revenue of a new province, Shivaji must have had the means to ascertain what was necessary by way of revenue, and would have taken steps to assure himself that the bulk of what was collected went into his treasury. Of course in the stages of the initial introduction of administration in a newly conquerred province recently emerging from war, things are not likely to be quite regular, but that the revenue should all be appropriated by the officials to the extent the words of Martin would imply, one might well doubt. It is hardly necessary to exonerate Raghunāth Pant and his official staff from all blame. In regard to the matter it

would be carrying credulity too far to accept the statement at its face value, as it would mean that in Mahratta administration, checks from above were non-existent even under Shivaji. Anyhow, as far as the main features of the Brahman administration so much complained against is concerned, it reveals a bureaucratic efficiency which hit hard the dishonest ryots certainly, and perhaps the honest ryot to some extent. If Raghunāth Pant had been *Karbari* under Shahji and the son of Shahji, the *Karbari* must have been a trained administrator and administered the province carefully, and if Shivaji placed him at the head of the revenue administration of the new province, the appointment could not have been for the purpose of Raghunāth Pant and his official staff swallowing all the revenue for themselves, with a ruler like Shivaji above. But that has nothing to do with the Golkoṇḍa administration or Madanna directly.

Judged on the whole, the administration of Madanna may be regarded in some respects thoroughly good; and such unpopularity as attached to him and his administration were incidental to the exigencies of war and the demands of the abnormal position of Golkoṇḍa during the period.

We have pointed out elsewhere that the arrangements made for carrying on mining operations at Gollapallee* in the Krishna District show themselves in several particulars very much more advantageous than the arrangements

* *Journal of Indian History*, Vol. ix. p. 361. Also Proceedings of *the Indian Historical Records Commission*, Patna, 1930.

under which diamond mining had to be carried on under Mir Jumla in the neighbouring Districts. In the mining localities of Ramallakotta, as Tavernier calls this, actually Ravalkonda and Kollur in the neighbourhood, the terms imposed according Tavernier's account seem very hard, and leave comparatively little to the miners by way of wages or profits. Whereas the mines which were working in Gollapallee earned more and looked very much better in condition as testified to by Sir Streynsham Master who noted it carefully in his diary. These Gollapallee mines were brought into work, after having remained abandoned for about two or three years, in 1673, almost with the accession of Madanna and Akkanna to power under Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah, and by the time that Sir Streynsham Master visited the locality the mines should have been working for seven or eight years. The following extract gives an idea of the condition of the workers :

'The two towns of Mellavallee and Razipent the mines are very large and populous, but the buildings all thatched hovels ; the people are well fed, well clothed and look as though they fed well to undergo the hot labour, though corn etc., sold at excessive rates ; and the place must needs be full of money to pay thirty or forty thousand labourers in the mines besides many others.'

Further down he notes :

'The country around the locality looked "pleasant like England or London, but Razipent is a large pleasant

green valley full of flocks of woolly sheep; thence to Mustabad where we lodged this night, we travelled through the mountainous country, by very pleasant valleys with tanks of water, and came to our journeys' end about 8 at night, having travelled two gentue leagues." '

In regard to this passage as many as forty or fifty thousand labourers worked, the labourers earned as much as 15 pagodas a year and the town paid a rent of 60,000 pagodas. The customs duties which were usual were 50 per cent here unlike in the other mines where it was quite a 100 per cent. The license fees demanded were two pagodas, and four to five pagodas, per mensem, according to the number of labourers. Where a similar number of labourers were engaged, it was two pagodas per diem, under the old arrangements. If the details be compared, the arrangement made under Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah show themselves liberal and to the great advantage of the growth of the industry. The two sets of arrangements were those made by that great administrator Mir Jumla under Abdulla Quṭub Shah in the one case, and the arrangements made by Madanna and Akkanna under Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah in the other.

In the light of what has been said above, the estimate of the Dutch journalist which he had set down briefly in the four portraits that he had drawn of (1) Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah, (2) Madanna, (3) Akkanna, and (4) the riotous scene in which the two brothers were murdered and dragged about, would seem anything but true. Of the first he says: ' He was king only in name and not in deed. He

attained to that dignity from the very lowest position, and allowed himself and his kingdom to be governed by others. He was a stupid and silly man, and not kingly in manners (never behaved like a king); when now fortune had fooled with him for a long time, he was kicked by (deprived of) his crown and throne by his own faults. He crept in the sand, ate dust and had to humiliate himself (behave) like a slave. Woe to that country where kings are mere children.' This certainly is an overdrawn picture. The supersession of the first minister and general was an act of Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah as well as the appointment of the Brahman brothers Madanna and Akkanna. According to the hostile evidence of authorities, otherwise dependable, that he entrusted the administration to others may be admitted as true; but that he took no responsibility therefore nor took any part in it, stands unproved from what has been said above. Certainly he lost his kingdom ultimately as many others had done before. The inaccuracies of this writer do not come out clearly in this. We come upon them fully in the next passage regarding 'Madanna-Sūryaprakāśa Rao.' 'Here we see Madanna drawn to life who was the plaything of fortune from the beginning of his youth until his death. He has risen from nothing to such a high level that even the king must obey him. He has removed his own master from office and state. (O, sacrilegious act of scoundrelism!) Nay, he dared to do anything, But, while attempting to deliver his king into the hands of his enemy, he was discoverd, and lost his life through Sidemakta's sword. In the end, after all, the burden must be borne.' This exhibits to the fullest extent the unsatisfactory character of the information possessed by this illustrious representative

of the fourth estate. Madanna started life in a small capacity under one of the most capable administrators of the Quṭub Shahi kingdom—Mir Jumla; and by steady work rose from position to position till he came very near the top when Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah found him ready to hand, in his effort to remove a minister who wanted to reduce him to the condition of a cypher. Such a career is not what exactly could be described as a 'plaything of fortune.' The Muhammadan surroundings were not likely to have been friendly to the advancement of Madanna and his brother. If in spite of it they could rise, it must have been through work, and certainly through some little of worth. That is for the first part of the statement. There could be absolutely no truth in either of the two statements that he makes regarding his treatment of Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah. It nowhere appears in any authority that he was handing over the Quṭub Shah into the hands of the Mughal. It was much rather otherwise. He had taken steps years before, in anticipation of this end, to provide a safe position for the Quṭub Shah to retreat into when such a need arose. It was through his efforts actively seconded by the approval and active co-operation of the Quṭub Shah himself, that Kondapalli was being fortified, and a strongly fortified city was almost ready for occupation if the Quṭub Shah was not unduly suspicious. Even when the enemy was at his doors, it was the advice of Madanna that the Quṭub Shah should not immure himself in the fortress of Golkoṇḍa, but rather fight in the open and escape, if need be, to the distant fortress of Kondapalli. So the more serious of the two statements could be proved wrong to the very hilt. It is not so easy to demonstrate that he

threw his master into the background; that he literally removed him from his office is perhaps unwarranted even for a journalist's information; but that he carried on the administration which, to all external appearances, seemed as though he was ultimately responsible for, and not his sovereign, is quite possible; but that it need not necessarily be, needs no demonstration. As was pointed out above, a vigorous policy of retrenchment was adopted. It could be done only when the minister believed that he had persuaded the king, or the king persuaded himself, that the minister was doing the right thing. When the king had given the minister his confidence, then it would certainly appear as though the minister was doing everything and the master nothing. That this may be only for the look, the fact being otherwise, is quite possible, and seems in this case to have been the truth.

What this authority says of Akkanna certainly is 'tarring with the same brush.' He speaks of Akkanna as 'a beast in human form: whose cunning wicked tricks, whose scoundrelism and pride, should not be uttered (spoken of). No greater villain did the town of Golkoṇḍa ever witnessed. Participating the treason of his brother he was never contented; he suffered the same punishment and at the same time as Madanna.' This requires no separte criticism. Akkanna seems to have been a man of overweening character, but that he participated in the treason of his brother which has no bottom to rest on, may therefore be dismissed as being no more reliable than the other. In regard to this matter of the treason of the Hindu ministers, Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah seems to have been firm in his confidence in the

brothers, till the defection of Mirza Ibrahim, the Sar-i-Khel.* In spite of the fact that several of his other generals remained loyal to him, the defection of Ibrahim was put before him as though that of a protege of Madanna's, and, at the critical time, the king's mind was haunted with suspicion whether it was the doing of the minister. It was then that he decided to immure himself in the fortress of Golkoṇḍa. Madanna advised him not to shut himself up in Golkoṇḍa, but to move out towards Warangal and keep himself free, beating in reinforcements and finding safety in a distant fortress. It was the evil genius of Abul Hasan in the person of Shaik Minhaj which misinterpreted even this advice, and confirmed the rising suspicion in him against the minister. Madanna seems to have believed that the attack on him, and the fate that overtook the brothers were actually given effect to under the orders of the Sultan. Iswar Dās, one of the writers of authority contemporary with the event, puts it into the mouth of Madanna, crying out against Abul Hasan, 'O, thoughtless fool, as you are slaying me at the interested accusation of my enemies without investigating the truth of the charge, I know that the term of your kingship has neared its end. You will not sit on your throne for more than six months after this.' Sir Jadunath Sarkar records that Khafi Khan was particularly well informed regarding the affairs at Hyderabad; and Khafi Khan

*In regard to this Ibrahim, Abul Hasan's dissatisfaction was a growing one. As early as 22nd March 1682, he was dissatisfied with the general for his part in the operations against the Mughals, and the taking of Basavapatam by the Nāik of Ikkēri. In a letter of May 17 idem, Ibrahim was removed from the Sar Laskarship by Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah after a visit to Madanna in his house. See note above. Also, Martin entries for April 1678, p. 325, and August idem, pp. 331-2.

states clearly that the murder of the ministers was perpetrated without Abul Hasan's knowledge or consent. Even Bhim Singh, the author of the Dil Kasha, who was present at Shah Alam's camp at the time, agrees with Khafi Khan in regard to this point. As against these authorities the statement of the journalist will have to be taken as something worse than bazaar gossip.

This provides a very apt illustration for demonstrating how far contemporary evidence can be positively wrong and even absurdly misleading. The statements contained in the *Havart* in the essential particulars of the career of the Golkoṇḍa ministers are every one of them wrong in the light of other evidence. As was pointed out before, it was not possible that Akkanna and Madanna could have started their career under Mir Jumla, and, at the same time, commenced their career in A.D. 1666. The chances are that they commenced their career under Mir Jumla in a humble capacity, that means, in a comparatively small official position to begin with, and from there they gradually worked their way up to the high position that they were in at the time of the accession of Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah. That is the first point.

The next point is that Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah himself was not such a worthless man, that he placed himself in the hands of his ministers entirely and made a nobody of himself. This again seems to be very much aside of the fact according to the authorities relied on by Sir Jadunath Sarkar, and which, in the circumstances, seem very probable indeed. Having regard to the circumstances of Abul Hasan's position before he became Sultan of Golkoṇḍa, it

was very likely that his Mussalman ministers showed themselves to be far from showing the respect due to his position, because of his previous humble station in life. The man that felt this humiliation and took prompt measures to counteract it by appointing those men of his own creation, on whose loyalty he could count, certainly was not the man, who is likely to resign so completely his power into the hands of his ministers, even though they be of his own creation, as to obliterate himself. The chances are, what one often does meet with in bureaucratic administrations, that the officials are allowed to carry on the administration under the authority of the chief, the chief keeping himself not so open to access to everybody for the sake of the attainment of the unity and thorough efficiency of administration. Abul Hasan's position seems to have been something like that. The complaint that is made by the servants of the English East India Company, as well as the Dutch East India Company, is that he was not accessible to them, or to their agents, to do them the favours that they sought, which were really privileges, which, if accorded to them, would lead to the inconvenience of an administration within an administration, which both the minister and the king alike would wish to avoid, but did not wish to say so plainly. If the king therefore was not as accessible to these agents as they would have liked it, we should not be surprised if these people chafed under the authority of the ministers and the inexorable character of their administrative demands, and speak ill of the king himself. We meet with passages here and there in the English Correspondence of that tenor and what the Dutch Journal, *Havart* has to say is nothing different in point of character from the

complaints that the East India Company's servants actually made.

But the really decisive point in regard to the matter is where the Dutch Journal charges Madanna with having betrayed successfully, or having very nearly succeeded in doing so, Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah into the hands of Aurangzeb. This is not at all possible even to be thought of. The whole head and front of the Quṭub Shah's offending the emperor was his appointment of these Brahman ministers, and of the confidence he placed in them. That was matter about which these men should have had knowledge; and apart from this particular knowledge Madanna and his brother should have known thoroughly what a fanatic Aurangzeb was, and what little they stood to gain by betraying Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah into his hands. If there was any purpose in this betrayal, it should have been selfish gain. But what sort of a selfish gain would these have made by betraying the Quṭub Shah, perhaps the liberal-minded ruler of Golkoṇḍa, into the hands of a fanatic like Aurangzeb? Taken all round therefore this contemporary authority shows himself to be possessed of no information of any authority, and is merely ventilating the gossip of the bazaars, such as he might have heard, some interested Islamic gossiper, who might have chafed under disappointments or inconveniences of his own. So it becomes clear that absolutely contemporary evidence could be about as misleading as later evidence, and the character of contemporaneity gives the information no guarantee that it is more correct than the information that might be gathered at a latter period, perhaps from more

authentic sources. It would be unsafe to accept as true all contemporary evidence, and cast aside all evidence of a later period as necessarily the less reliable.

Before concluding the subject, we would like to invite attention to an interesting note appended to Chapter XLVI of Professor Sarkar's *History of Aurangzeb*. After giving some details in regard to these brothers, he makes the following concluding reflections ;—'He (Madanna) had never realised that the ultimate basis of government is force, and that a minister might bask in the sunshine of royal favour and trust, but if he has no army behind him, his position is precarious and his power a hollow show. Evidently long political degradation of the Hindu population of Golkoṇḍa had robbed them of the power of self-defence', The reflection contained in the first sentence of his quotation and its implication would command but little approval among recognised authorities in state-craft. We pointed out before already that Sultan Quṭub Shah's change of ministers at the commencement of his reign was because of this possibility, and even if that were a sound political dictum of general adoption by ministers, how does it serve the ministers really usefully ? Muhammad Gawan, the great Bahmani minister and several others, whose names could be cited in a similar position in Bahmani history, had not gained by providing themselves with a military force to fall back upon unless it be to create a civil war, local turmoil and bloodshed. Whatever it might have been in Islamic politics, that certainly was not the principle that was accepted among Hindu politicians. A minister was a servant of the ruler and was not

to set up as a rival, and Brahman ministers always pursued it as a solemn policy in state-craft. Even in the matter of the provision of *jāghīrs*, what may have been conferred upon a Brahman was not regarded, and had not become, hereditary. It began with him, and he continued to enjoy the privilege only so long as he held the office. Apart from that, here is a dictum or two from the great Vijayanagar ruler, king Krishṇadēvarāya, in regard to Brahman ministers in particular:—

'If a Brahman who is a scholar, who is afraid of *adharma*, who is well-versed in *Rājanīti*, and who is between the ages of fifty and seventy, who is healthy in body, whose connection with the king has come down from previous generation and who is not conceited, accepts the ministership under a king and looks after his business would it take more than a day for the *angās* (constituents of royalty) of such a king to increase?'

'In the absence of such a minister if a king is not contented with ruling himself to the best of his genius according to (the science of polity) and with the help of a strong army and a full treasury, and has recourse to a minister who is devoid of virtues, the minister would prove a source of trouble like the pearl of the size of a pumpkin and the king would ultimately find himself in the hands of that minister.'

It is not the tradition therefore of Brahman ministership to provide themselves with forces to fight the sovereign in time of need. This would mean a preconcerted act of treason with an elaborate preparation therefor, which is

against the grain of sentiment of Hindu politics and Hindu statesmen. The Hindu population might have risen against the Muhammadans if the minister had been one who had been appointed to represent the Hindus of Golkoṇḍa. There was no such notion of communal politics in those days even of Mughal rule. The minister was a minister Hindu or Mussalman, and he was the minister of the Sultan; and whether it was physically possible for the Hindus to rise, even if they wished, is another question. But the ordinary Hindu feeling is, if a minister misbehaves and the ruler finds it necessary to punish him, it was a question purely of master and servant, not a question of a civil war between a suzerain and a feudatory.

On the whole, therefore, a synthetic appreciation of the whole mass of evidence would justify the conclusion that Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah was not such an absolutely incompetent ruler, as it is ordinarily taken. The Brahman ministers that he chose of his own free will were men who carried on the administration in the best interests of the sovereign and the state, according to their lights. Their fall was due not to any act of treason on their part, but to the machinations of a greater power, fanatic in the extreme in regard to a Shiah sovereign and his Brahman ministers, who had set his heart upon conquering these southern kingdoms by all means in his own power, without any scruple as to the actual means adopted to gain this end.

[*Reprinted from the Journal of Indian History, Vol. X, Part II.*]

Raja Desing of Ginjee

(An episode in the History of the Moghul Carnatic)

The followiug extract is taken from the section bearing on the history of Ginjee from a manuscript folio book in the Mackenzie colleetion. The book as a whole purports to be a history of the Rājas of the lunar line and other Hindu rulers. It was written by one Narayana Pillai, son of Kallaha Rāma Ranga Pillai and a descendant of the shepherd, Ananda Koil Kovalan, the founder and ruler of Ginjee and Paḍaivīḍu. Narayanan composed this history from what he had learnt either from books or by hearsay from the members of his family and other elders of the place. He says that he compared his account with large books on history (Tavārik), such as Ferishta and other works. He submitted his account for verification to Muhammadan amīrs of age and others well learned in Tamil. Having collected his information in this way, he has made an effort to compile an account which appeared to be acceptable to his historical sense. In order that it may be acceptable to those high placed in Government service, he took the trouble to carry it to Arcot, where there were Muhammadan gentlemen living, with records and books, who could enlighten him. It is there that he came into contact with the Collector of the Subha, Col. William Macleod, as he calls him. He got the account compared through Amir-ud-din Ali, son of Muhammad

Murad, the Company's Sadar at Vellore. This Ali introduced him to Col. William Macleod, and, after cautioning him as to the importance of compiling a correct account, Col. Macleod asked the said Ali to hear his account in full and bring him over to him afterwards for his own hearing.

The manuscript consists of four sections: Section 1 contains the history of the Rājas of the lunar line; Section 2 gives the history of the Muhammadan rulers of Delhi; the third section contains a history of the Dakhan comprising the Mahratta and Tuḷu countries; and the fourth consists of history of Ginjee and the Karnāṭak (known in British Indian History as Carnatic Payeen Ghat). The extract that follows is taken from Section 4, which is much more historical than the previous sections.

The date of the actual composition of the work is fixed by the reference to Col. Macleod. The manuscript writes the name variously, partly due to the blunder of the copyist and partly due to other exigencies, Sometimes it is written *Makvot*, the *la* and the *va* being written sometimes very like each other, and the mistake therefore becoming possible. In the poetical passages the name gets to be written Macleod William instead of William Macleod as in the prose passages, the former being due entirely to the exigencies of verse. Soon after the annexation of Arcot, the British Government at Madras, particularly the Board of Revenue, had to make arrangements for carrying on the revenue administration. They appointed one man and then another to initiate an administration by a new

settlement of the revenues, etc. Being a difficult affair, the first Collectors did not prove as great a succes as the Board of Revenue wished and they had to be changed rapidly. The officers at the headquarters were anxious for a large revenue. The men on the spot had a more clear conception of the actualities and struck out for a fairer assessment. So the first Collector had to go and the second Collector had to be changed soon, also through blunders of his own. The third one appointed was Macleod. He was Major Macleod at the time and 'the Colonel' of the manuscript may be merely a courtesy rank popularly given, The Government of Fort St. George felt the need for arranging for the proper government of the new acquisition, and divided the territory of the Nawab of Arcot that they annexed into a northern and a southern Arcot, Pālār being the dividing line. Arcot was annexed in 1801, and Macleod, the third Collector who succeeded about the end of the year 1802, remained in office till March 1804, when, owing to the inexorable character of the Board of Revenue, he was compelled to take leave 'on grounds of ill-health.' The manuscript therefore must have been composed during the fourteen months of the administration of Col. Macleod. We may therefore take it that the work was compiled in 1803.

The story of Rāja Dēśing, as we find it in this manuscript, is very sober and bears on the face of it the impress of an account of a contemporary character. Probably Nārāyaṇa Piḷḷai heard the account from those who were actually living in the vicinity when Rāja Dēśing and his father Surup Singh were conducting the administration of Ginjee, that is, the period A.D. 1699 to 1714. The account

starts with the fall of Ginjee to Zulfikar Khan, the Moghul general under Aurangzeb who was deputed to take possession of Ginjee after the fall of Bijapur and Golkoṇḍa. The story of the wars round Ginjee and its ultimate fall are well known, though the details are not quite so well established. The first fact that lends itself to investigation as a test is the date of the fall of Ginjee and what took place immediately after. Even Sir Jadunath Sarkar in his voluminous work on Aurangzeb leaves the question open. He quotes the *Māsir-i-Alamgiri* which gives a discrepant date, and the correction that the learned author suggests is also of an uncertain character. The next authority that he quotes is one in which he has full confidence, that is, *Nushak-i Dilkusha* of Bhimasen the Agent of Dalpat Rao Bundela, the officer of Aurangzeb. According to him, the fort fell on a *Sankarānti*, which he tries to interpret as the 2nd of January or the 31st, as either of them marks the entry of the sun into one of the signs of the zodiac, such being termed *Sankramaṇa* or *Sankarānti*. He also quotes the further authority of the *Diary and Consultation of Fort St. George*, where there is an entry that on the 2nd of January, 1698, that all but one of the fortresses at Ginjee had fallen to Zulfikar Khan.* Now our authority here

*'M.A. 391 explicitly says that Ginjee was captured on 6th Shaban forty-first year of Aurangzeb (7th February, 1698). The *Madras Diary* of 2nd January, 1698, records: 'A letter from Amir Jahan from the Mughal camp received to-day advises that the Nawab has taken the Ginjee forts all but one which also offers to capitulate.' If we read *Rajab* instead of Shaban in M.A., we get 8th January. Bhimasen (135a) says that the fort fell on a Sankarānti, which would give 2nd or 31st January. Chitnis (ii. 58) as usual is grossly incorrect, giving *Chaitra pratipad Sudi* 1618 = 23rd March, 1696, as the date of the capture'. Sarkar's Aurangzeb Vol. v, p. 108 n.

gives a precise date, namely, the Fasli year 1107, the year Iśvara, the month of Tai, day two, equivalent to Saturday, the 31st December, 1697, in modern computation. The entry in the *Fort St. George Diary* has reference to the 2nd of January. It would be three days from the date actually given here. The *Māsir-i-Alamgiri* is certainly wrong, though perhaps it is the official account. Bhimasen comes rather near to correctness if his datum that the fort fell on a *Sankarānti* should be properly interpreted. According to this account, the fort actually fell on the second of *Tai*. The first of *Tai* is generally known *Sankarānti* in these parts and is an agricultural festival for all people who celebrate it as *Sankarānti* not only the orthodox Brahman marking the entry of the sun into a new house of the zodiac. It happens to be the tenth house here. Bhimasen's reference to a *Sankarānti* therefore is not the monthly entry of the sun, but the special *Sankarānti* which usually comes about the middle of January now. It happened to be for that year on the 30th of December. On the 31st also the *Pongal* continues, which is sometimes spoken of also as *Sankarānti* loosely, and Bhimasen might have so heard it. That this was so can be inferred from the Fort St. George records in a letter to William Hatsell, Governor of Fort St. David. The Council of Fort St. George communicated: 'there is a report here that Zulphaker Cawn had got up his flag upon one of the hills of Ginjee, and makes a show as if he had really intended to take the place; a little time will show the truth,' on the 28th of December. Then, Ginjee had not fallen. Another entry, dated the 11th of January, 1698, in a letter to the same party states: 'It is certain that Zulphaker Cawn had

taken Ginjee' and wants Fort St. David to be careful and be prepared for an attack. The letter refers to a communication from Fort St. David, dated the 5th January, giving the news to them, and the letter in reply agrees with the view expressed by Mr. Hatsell. Therefore, then, Ginjee must have fallen before the 5th of January, and the actual date of the fall must be between the 28th of December, 1697, and the 5th of January, 1698. Having regard to the general statement, that Ginjee fell on a *Sankarānti*, that is, the 30th of December, 1697, our record comes as close to a precisely correct date as it is possible in the circumstances, in whatever manner the author had acquired the date. The actual difference between the 30th *Sankarānti* and the 31st of the chronicle may be one of looseness of language regarding *Sankarānti* of Bhimasen, or of the fort having actually fallen or taken before sunrise or after.

The next point in which this account differs materially from those of the others is the circumstances and the character of the retirement of Rājārām from Ginjee. As Professor Sarkar's account has it, Rājārām was just able to take himself away leaving behind even his wives and children,* and that, while the Nawab offered them escort

* 'The Mahratta royal family begged for safety, which was promised to them, and *palkis* were sent for their conveyance. Four wives, three sons and two daughters of Rājārām now came out of the citadel and were kept in honourable captivity. Another wife of the Rāja avoided surrender; she flung herself down from the summit of the fort into the sheer depths below. Her head struck a projecting rock and she was killed instantly, but her mangled corpse was caught in the branches of a tree on the hillside at an inaccessible place and there it lay without funeral. Nearly 4,000 men, women and children were found in the fort, but very few combatants. (*Dil.* 124)'. *Ibid.*, p. 108.

and arranged to send them away, one of them declined to accept the hospitality of the Nawab, and, dropping herself down a sheer precipice, lost her life.* To begin with, this seems to be rather against the complaint of collusiveness, which, on all hands, has been ascribed to Zulfikar Khan's prosecution of the siege of Ginjee, and his unwillingness to take the fortress, lest the fall of the fortress should free the army and make it available for Aurangzeb to send it out on a distant expedition to the North-Western Frontier, which the general and the army alike disliked. The account of Narayana Pillai here is that all the while the Nawab was feigning an attack, and whenever it was proposed to make an attack, Rājārām had previous intimation, as the Company's records bear out. As on this occasion, the Nawab was compelled to make a serious attack, on the representation of Yāchama Nāyaka at Venkaṭagiri, the attack was made after the said Nāyaka had been killed by Zulfikar Khan. It is difficult to believe that Rājārām had no intimation of it. Whether Zulfikar Khan gave intimation or not, Rājārām apparently had intimation of what was taking place in the Nawab's camp and planned his retreat accordingly. He seems to have taken a somewhat sequestered way out of the fort with all his family and entourage, and got out of the fort in the night safely unknown to the besiegers. From various references in the records of Fort St. George, he loitered about the Karnāṭak

* *Letters from Fort St. George, 1698: letter, dated 1st March.*— 'There are credible reports that the Morattas who lately came to Vellore have carryed away Ramaraja with them and that the Nabob three dayes since out from Wandevas for Vellore with the army onely, leaving the baggage att Wandevas.'

and remained in Vellore till a contingent of 3,000 Mahratta horse came from Poona and took him safely from Vellore in the month of March following.* In the light of these, therefore, the account of Bhimasen may not be exactly correct in details.

Practically all the year 1698 Zulfikar Khan was making his own arrangements and Daud Khan was ultimately put in charge when Zulfikar left for the imperial camp. The Fort St. David correspondence gives us clear indication of

* *Letters from Fort St. George, 1698, letter, dated 4th March.*— 'But it hath happened in this juncture 4 or 5,000 Morattas came to Vellore, whither Ramaraja had escaped from Chingee which obliged the Nabob to carry his Army thither. Ramaraja upon that news is gone from Vellore with the said Morattas, and the Nabob follows them, but probably no further then the extent of his Countrey, and his returne is expected suddainly after which itt will appear whether he do's really design to trouble us. Att present wee can make no judgment having yet received no answer to the letters sent him so that wee find reason to confirme the caution given you in the inclosed, and the rather because the last letters received from Fort St. David yesterday give an account of their advices, that Seilim Cawn doth threaten and prepair for another assult of Cuddaloor.'

Letters from Fort St. George, 1698, letter, dated 8th March.— 'Spye Bramines from the Camp advise that the Nabob hath followed after Ramaraja as far as Gurrum(c)unda and that from thence the Nabob will returne to Sautgur and from thence to Arcott to keep the Ramzan. Amerjeahan is gone with the Camp, but there is no Letter from him since he sett out from Wandevas, so soon as wee heare anything from him shall communicate itt to you'.

Letters from Fort St. George, 1698, letter, dated 28th March.—'Last night our peons came from the camp who advise that the camp was 8 days agœ beyond Gurrungunda, and that the Nabob designed to go (after hee had finished some business with Polligars) against Vellore.'

it. It was in the year following that the imperial rescript was sent ordering the appointment of a Bundela chieftain, Surup Singh, as Killadhar of Ginjee and superseded the temporary arrangements made by Zulfikar Khan. Surup Singh is said to have been a man in personal attendance upon 'the Bundela chief'. The account leaves it open whether he was dependent on Dalpat Ray Bundela, or another Bundelkhand chieftain. He was appointed Killadhār and succeeded to the responsibilities of the Nawab of the Karnāṭak over all the territory appertaining to the province of Ginjee. We need not go through all the details of the administration of Surup Singh, which is not exactly our concern, nor does the account publish many details regarding these. Apparently Surup Singh conducted himself as an efficient administrator and carried on the administration to the satisfaction of the *Foujdar* of Arcot, Daud Khan. Daud Khan retired from Arcot in 1704 and Surup Singh continued, perhaps with more power, under his successor Sadat-ullah Khan and the Dewan Dakhni Roy. There was apparently no trouble during Bahadur Shah's reign except perhaps that Surup Singh took advantage of the change in headquarters to be slack in the payment of the monies due. It is the accession of Faruksiyar who took the throne, and the assumption of power by the Sayyad brothers, that brought to the notice this remissness of Surup Singh. A demand was accordingly made, and perhaps Surup Singh found it impossible to get out of the bargain; he managed to pay up the arrears and put himself fair and square with respect to his imperial master. But the accession of Faruksiyar and the changes that followed in quick succession upset much, and perhaps it was

the new order of things in regard to the governorships that made the position of Surup Singh somewhat delicate. But he managed to live it down and died without having settled the question. In these circumstances, his son Dēśing happened to be, at the time of the last illness of his father, in Bundelkhand. He naturally marched at the head of an escort, and his taking possession of Ginjee in succession to his father was the beginning of the trouble. The matter in dispute between Dēśing and Nawab Sadat-ullah Khan was one almost exactly the same as that between the British at Fort St. David and the Nawabs of the Karnāṭak and the Killadhārs of Ginjee. The question of the right of possession by grant of a *firman* in this particular case, the imperial *firman* of Aurangzeb, and whether a subsequent *firman* of Faruksiyar could overthrow a title established through a period of more than twelve years. Dēśing took the line of Aurangzeb's *firman* to his father giving them absolute right of the *Killadhāri*, while the Nawab held, in behalf of Faruksiyar, that a succession was not valid unless the emperor for the time being approved of it. The ten months' rule of Rāja Dēśing was one, on this account, of opposition and ended in a campaign conducted by Nawab Sadat-ullah Khan against Ginjee. Rāja Dēśing fought heroically against tremendous odds and fell fighting.

The simple story of Dēśing's succession and history has been magnified into a romance, and all that was known hitherto was an almost fabulous account of Dēśing incorporated in a populr ballad which is being sung ordinarily by people of all classes in the Tamil country. The account of the ballad begins with a very highly coloured, and absolutely

mythical, account of the character of the horse, which he rode. He is said to have got it from the Sultan of Delhi, who, in admiration to his success in taming the beast, gave his daughter in marriage with a *jāghīr*. In the ballad, the name of the father is wrongly given, and he is provided even with an uncle, which does not appear in the other account. The account of Narayana Pillai, however, makes it intelligibly historical. Dēśing, on his way from Bundelkhand up to his father's headquarters, passed through Bednūr, and obtained from the Rāja of Bednūr, in return for the assistance that he rendered, a particularly spirited horse, which he rode through all his battles. The story is something like Alexander and Beaucephalus and no more. His own guard was 350 horse. He had a body of 500 *killadhāri* soldiers. This is of course a slender force in comparison with the resources of the Nawab, and he fought like a hero. He succeeded in killing Dowlat Khan, the general of the Nawab, on the back of his elephant, and almost succeeded in taking the life of the Nawab himself by means of his splendid horse. There being no way of escape from the field of battle with his slender force, the Nawab made every attempt to capture him alive. He had, however, to be shot down at the critical moment to save the Nawab being killed. There is a representation of the last battle on a stone slab preserved in the Museum. Recently a writer in the *Madras Mail* gave this illustration and his own account of Rāja Dēśing. There are also Tamil books written upon the story of Rāja Dēśing, which young boys read in schools claiming to be historical expositions though they show but slender knowledge of history.

The Tamil name Dēśing stands for Tej Singh in Sanskrit. He was the son not of Thērani Singh but of Surup Singh of Bundelkhand. He had a personal friend in the son of the *killadhār* of Valudāvūr, a young Muhammadan by name Mohabat Khan who, with two of his own intimate friends, stood staunchly loyal to his friend and fought like Leonidas' 300 in the fight. Todar Mall occupied a position of something like a Foreign Secretary to the Nawab of Arcot, a high caste Hindu, a man of culture and of capacity. He tried by peaceful means to bring Dēśing to reason and failed, and reported to his master that, if Dēśing is to be tamed, it should only be by fight and not by arguments. Nawab Sadat-ullah Khan began life as a clever secretary, and was a capable and well-meaning administrator who wanted no war in particular, till it was forced upon him. The account of Narayana Pillai in regard to this is quite sober and narrates the events in a manner to carry conviction as a true account, in whatever manner he came by his knowledge. He was a native of Ginjee apparently, and could write but indifferent Tamil. His account is written in a brogue, a sort of hybrid between bazaar Tamil and the official Hindustani-written Tamil. He could, however, state the incidents clearly and observe the sequence. As he claims in the preface, he seems to have had some little critical power and applied it usefully. He sometimes offers opinions, perhaps without adequate knowledge, and does not show himself a partisan of Dēśing. He shows himself rather the other way. The narrative presented of Dēśing probably conveys all the correct history of the hero and his short ten months' rule of Ginjee.

The date of the death of Dēśing is precisely given in the narrative, and the details given are found to be correct

according to the *Indian Ephemeris* of the late Dewan Bahadur L. D. Swamikannu Pillai, corresponding to Sunday, 3rd October, 1714.*

(*Translation of Narayana Pillai's Account.*—In the wars of Aurangzeb in the south, the operations round Ginjee constitute an important episode, and the siege itself is said to have lasted for a period of twelve years till ultimately it fell. Since the episode of Rāja Dēśing arises directly out of the fall of Ginjee, we may well begin the story with the fall of the fortress.)

The Nawab † having in this manner pretended to be operating seriously carried on the siege of the fortress to the year Fasli 1106 (A.D. 1696). The Nawab so operated in the belief that, if the *Padusha* had no trouble in Hindustan, the Dakhan or the Karnāṭak, the sepoys would have no work. This was generally known to all. In these circumstances and at this time, Bangāru Yāchama Nāyaka wrote a petition

---

* Wheeler, *Madras in Olden Times*, p. 337.— 'Saturday, October 9, 1714.— General Letter from the Deputy Governor and Council of Fort St. David, dated the 6th instant, advising that our Nabob Sadat-ulla Khan had drawn all his forces round Ginjee, and summoned Serope Singh's son to surrender, upon pretence of an order from Court to take possession of that place which he refused to do, and making a desperate sally with about 300 Rajpoots, was very near killing the Nabob, having cut the harness of his elephant with his own hands. But timely succour coming in to the Nabob's rescue, Tejah Singh, Serope Singh's son, with Mohabut Khan and several others of the principal men belonging to Ginjee, were overpowered and cut off, so that it is believed Ginjee wll surreneder in a few days'. On the 15th of November the news arrived that Ginjee was captured by Sadat-ulla Khan.

† Zulfikar Khan, the son of the minister Asad Khan.

to the *Padusha* that the Nawab Amir-ul-Umara Bahadur was actually helping Rājārām. The *Padusha* having seen the letter showed it to Nawab Asafud Dowlah Asad Khan, Vazir. The Nawab replied, 'I have been your Vazir for the past fifty years. Never will disloyalty be shown by any of kin to me to the *Padusha*.' On this the *Padusha* sent the petition of Yāchama Nāyaka enclosed in a *firman* to Amir-ul-Umara. Even Nawab Asad Khan Bahadur wrote to his son, Nawab Amir-ul-Umara, indicating that disloyalty would become ascribable to him through the son's conduct. The Amir-ul-Umara having seen the *firman* of the *Padusha* and the letter from his father, cut off the head of Yāchama-Nāyaka.

While this was the condition of affairs in camp, there arrived from the *Padusha* to the Nawab money and reinforcements under the command of Nawab Daud Khan, Muhammad Syed Kevud, Venkaṭapati and others. On the arrival of these, the siege of Ginjee was pushed on vigorously. Rājārām considered it was no more safe to remain in Ginjee. Taking with him from among the Mēlachēri Killadhārs, Kandē Rao and others with all the things, and *taking with him his wives and attendants, he was getting* ready to quit the fort. The Nawab was not aware of this. He actually thought that, as the siege had been going on for twelve years, and as even the *Padusha*'s resources were getting almost exhausted, the fortress was actually going to fall. He therefore ordered that the siege might be pressed and efforts made to take it without further delay. Nawab Daud Khan and his contingent attacked Sēnaghaḍi, Kevud and his contingent similarly

attacked Krishṇaghaḍi, while the Nawab (Amir-ul-Umara) with all the remaining forces sat down in front of the principal entrance to the fortress. In this stage of the siege, Rājārām opened the Tiruvaṇṇāmalai gate and, with all his impedimenta, got out of the fort and set forward marching westwards. The army of the Nawab, however, continued the siege, and the fort fell in the year of Fasli 1107, the year *Īśvara* month *Tai*, day 2 (Saturday, 31st December 1697). The fortress gate by which the Nawab entered it was called *Fatēh Dārvāja* (victory gate). Hearing that the enemy had escaped, the Nawab's army left the fort and surrounded Rājārām's forces. Rājārām's army fought its way successfully and arrived at Peṇṇāttūr. Attacked again there, they reached Tiruvaṇṇāmalai the next day, and breaking camp again there, the army of Rājārām marched through the pass of Chengama to Tirupattūr, thence to Kolar and ultimately reached Poona. The Nawab's army pursued them, till they passed the ghats and returned. The Amir Umara, taking possession of Ginjee, made arrangements for securing it by making Kakad Khan Killadhār. Khasbur Khan (Gussafur Khan of the *Fort St. George Records*) was made *Foujdār*. Further he made Daud Khan *Foujdār* of the Karnāṭak in accordance with the orders of the headquarters (*Huzur*) in the year of Fasli 1108* (A. D. 1698). Muhammad Sayyed Khan was made Dewan, Lala Dakni Ray was made Dewan Peishkar, Lala Toḍarmal was made Sheristadar of the Karnāṭak. The Amir-ul-Umara gave to Ginjee the name Nazrat Ghaḍ.†

* In the account, the figure for 100 is inadvertently omitted.

† The full name of the Nawab is Amir-ul-Umara Zulfikar Khan Bahadur Nazarath Jung. The name Nazarath apparently was taken from a part of his full title.

With a view to taking Tanjore in the Chōḷa country, he marched forward and encamped at Tiruvādi (Tiruvaiyār). The Bhosla or Bhonsla king* of Tanjore, *Ekoji*-Tukaji, sent his vakil and, by paying *Nazar* and contributions for the expenses of the troops, he came to an agreement by undertaking to pay tribute. Similarly the Nāyak-Rāja of Trichinopoly and the Rājas of Ramnad and Śivagaṅga were put under tribute. While the Nawab Amir-ul Umara was making these arrangements, information reached the *Padusha* that Yāchama Nāyaka had been killed. The *Padusha* sent forward orders that the late Nāyak's son, Kumāra Yāchama Nāyaka, be installed in his place with a suitable *Mansab* and *jāghīr*. The Amir sent for Kumāra Yāchama Nāyaka, communicated to him the orders of the *Padusha* and gave him the *jāghīr* of Venkaṭagirikoṭah. To the contingent sent forward by the Rāja of Jeypore under Sirdar Śivanath Singh, the Nawab presented *jāghīrs* both to the Commander and to the Sepoys in the districts of Ginjee, Tiruvaṇṇāmalai and Tiruvādi and in the places under the irrigation districts of the anicut at Tiruvaṇṇai-nallūr. Śivanath Singh was under the same orders given the *killadhāri* of Chengi, Madanmust and Dēśur. In addition to a *Mansab*, Śivanath Singh came into possession of these *Killedhāris* in Fasli 1107, year Īśvara. In these circumstances, *Padusha* Alamghir sent Surup Singh with a *Mansab* of 2,000, a *jāghīr* of twelve lakhs and the *killadhāri* of Ginjee. Surup Singh was a man in immediate attendance on the Rāja of Bundelkhand, Surup Singh by name. He took the man from the Rāja, and, giving him the title of Surup Singh, sent him on to the Nawab Amir-ul-Umara

* Written by an error Kosala.

with the *firman* above mentioned. Under this *firman*, the Nawab, Amir-ul-Umara gave him the *killadhāri* of Ginjee and sent him with the order to Kisafar Khan (the Gussafar Khan of the *Company's Records*) and Kakadkhan. Surup Singh entered office as *Killadhār* of Ginjee in the year of Fasli 1110, year *Vikrama*, (or A. D. 1700) and took possession of the fortress of Ginjee. Killadhār Kisafar Khan and Foujdār Kakad Khan retired and joined the army of the Nawab. Payya Ramakrishna was appointed *Vak Navis* (Secretary). Shaik Nur was appointed head of the guard. Shikar Udaya Ram became *Jupya Navis*. Chalchiram became *Taḥavildar*. Śrī Ram became *Hazar Amani*. Other officials like *Hazar Mendi*, *Hazar Thopachi* and others of the Padushayi service numbering 5,000 remained as khilla *dhaināth* under the orders of the Nawab. Surup Singh kept with him this *dhaināth* 5,000 along with his own three hundred horse, took possession of his own *jāghir* of the *eight veli parganah* in Ginjee, Vaḻudāvūr, Tinḍivanam, Tiruvāmāttūr, Aśapūr, Tirukkōvilūr, Vēṭṭaivanam and places like that. Nawab Amir-ul-Umara Zulfikar Khan Bahadur Nazarath Jung, in accordance with the orders of the *Padusha*, made over the *foujdāri* of the Karnāṭak to Daud Khan as *Foujdār*, Muhammad Sayyad Khan as Dewan, Todar Mall as Sheristadar, and reached Aurangabad in the same year Vikrama. Nawab Daud Khan, taking his army with him, encamped himself on the south bank of the Pālār as usual and remained there in camp. That place has since become the town of Arcot. Ramaining there he conducted the work of the *Foujdāri* of the Karnāṭak on the lines laid down by his predecessors, particulary by Nawab Amir-ul-Umara, collecting the *nazar* and *peishkush* arranged

for him from the *Killadhārs*, *Jāghīrdārs*, *Mansabdars*, the *Poligārs* who were established from the time of the Rājas and others. He also sent out *Amildārs* for collecting the *amani* dues from the *khalsa* lands, the revenues from the *koṭi* at Bhandar (Masulipatam) and remitted to the Huzur the 15 lakhs, the *Irsal* amount according to the *Ijari*. He built for himself a bungalow in Mylapore and fortified the town. He conducted the administration with justice and remained in Arcot till the fasli year 1114 (A.D. 1704).

In these circumstances and, in accordance with the orders of the *Padusha* Alamghir (Aurangzeb), he appointed Muhammad Sayyad Khan Dewan to carry on the administration officiating in his place (*Kathyāri*) and left for the imperial headquarters leaving instructions that Sayyad Khan should write to him regular reports and arrange for sending out an agent to him also. In accordance with these instructions, Sayyad Khan carried on his administration appointing Roy Dakhiniray as his Dewan. He got for his elder brother, Ghulam Ali Khan, the *Killadhāri* of Velur by recommending to the headquarters and obtaining their *firman* and *tasvisnāma*. Ghulam Ali Khan thus got the *Killadhāri* of Velur with a *mansab* of one thousand. He also wrote his reports and obtained the necessary *firman* and *tasvisnāma* in favour of the *Killadhārs* of his own choice for the Karṇāṭakghaḍi, Kailāsghaḍi, Wandivash, Timir, and other places in the Karnāṭak already. The *Padusha* accordingly sent to Sayyad Khan a *mansab* of 3,000 and the title Sadat-ullah Khan. Nawab Sadat-ullah Khan proved a good administrator of the Karnāṭak keeping himself on good terms with the *jāghīrdārs* of the Karnāṭak

and the Rājas of Trichinopoly, Tanjore, Madura and Venkaṭagiri, collecting from them the due *peishcush* as well as the other revenues from the *Sircar* taluks according to the established arrangements. He collected the dues with justice and remitted the dues to the headquarters along with the accounts at the fixed time. He also managed to be on good terms with the officials of the Dewan's Office (*mutsadis*) by means of gifts, *takhrir* and *paridana*. While everybody concerned spoke well of him, the *Padusha* was greatly pleased with him as a very efficient administrator, fully justifying the expectations of his youth as a very intelligent young man. About this time, *Padusha* Alamghir died and was succeeded by his son who let the administration of the Karnāṭak go on as before. The Nawab conducted himself in his days by remitting regularly the *Izara* due to the *Sircar*, the tribute due from the Karnāṭak by way of *nazar* and the usual durbar expenditure. When afterwards Faruksiyar succeeded as *Padusha*, the *Killadhār* of Ginjee Surup Singh had become a regular defaulter for ten years without sending even the *peishcush* or *Nazar*, and otherwise taking forcible possession of the *Sircar Khalsa* villages and disregarding the order of the *Foujdār* in regard to these matters. Sadat-ullah Khan therefore intimated the matter in his report to the *Padusha* and made a separate report that Surup Singh owed to the *Foujdāri* 70 lakhs of rupees, filing accounts to prove it. Having examined the accounts and reports, the *Padusha* in anger threw Surup Singh's Vakil into prison and ordered that he might write to Surup Singh to pay up the seventy lakhs of rupees to the *Foujdār* of the Karnāṭak. In this state of affairs certain of the Amirs in the court spoke in favour of Surup

Singh and presented his case favourably to court. The agent of Sadat-ullah Khan, on the contrary, by name Tipudās, worked through the agency of the court Daroga Kuṭbuḍin undertaking to pay two lakhs of rupees to the durbar for expenditure through the Bukansi Kasidas' business house (*Khoṭi*). He also filed a *darkhast* in these terms at the Huzur office. Having seen these, the *Padusha* sent out a *firman* informing Sadat-ullah Khan of this and issued orders on these terms to Surup Singh.* Having learnt from news letters of all that had taken place, Surup Singh was sorrow-stricken and, falling ill, died sometime after.† News of this illness reached the house of Surup Singh in Bundelkhand.

Dēśing (Tej Singh), the son of Surup Singh, immediately started with his wife and fifty horse and attendants,

---

* Wheeler, *Madras in Olden Times*, p. 323.

'Zulfikar Khan being out off, there came immediate orders from Court to re-assume all the lands and villages that were granted him in these parts by Aurungzebe, in consideration of his good services in the conquest of the Ginjee country. Accordingly the Dewan Sadat-ulla Khan sent us a summons to deliver up Egmore, etc., villages granted us by Zulfikar Khan on account of the assistance we gave him with ammunition, and what else he wanted to carry on his designs. We have hitherto staved this business off with good words and pleading our rights; and when the new Nabob (Nizam) comes nearer, we will endeavour to get our grant confirmed. In the meantime, if any force is used to take them from us, we resolve to defend them as well as we can. We are in daily expectation that our Dewan Sadat-ulla Khan will be turned out, as having been a creature and vassal of Zulfikar Khan. For which reason, we avoid purchasing his friendship in this matter by presents.'

† A day or two before 20th December, 1713, Fort. St. George, Consultation, dated 24th December 1713.

'From Thoms Frederick Esqr. Depty. Governr. of Fort St. David dated 20th inst. advising the death of Serope Singh Rajah of Chingee.'

and arrived at Bidanur (Bednūr) in the Karnāṭak. At that time the Rāja of Bidanur was much troubled by the Mahratta Sardārs between whom and himself frequent skirmishes were taking place. Having heard of Rāja Dēśing's arrival, the Rāja of Bidanur urged the friendship of Dēśing's father, Surup Singh, the *Killadhār* of Ginjee and persuaded Dēśing to render him assistance, by showing him letters received from Surup Singh. After due consideration of the proposal, and, on the representation of the chief officials of Bidanur who carried the letter, Rāja Dēśing agreed to assist the Rāja of Bidanur and attacked his enemies with his own forces. His contingent distinguished itself and succeeded in turning back the assailants. The Rāja of Bidanur in return paid one lakh of rupees and made him a present, with great pleasure, of an extraordinarily good horse in his stables, which nobody had been able to ride before. The animal actually cost him twelve thousand rupees. Having heard the description of the horse, Dēśing proceeded to the stables and found the animal tame at his approach. Dēśing was able to ride the animal without trouble and thus secured the present for himself in addition to the money, the dress and jewels. With all these, he arrived at Ginjee. Surup Singh had died in the meanwhile, while Dēśing was still on the way from Bundelkhand to Bidanur.* Reaching Ginjee, Dēśing performed the

---

* There is an apparent discrepancy here. The narrative seems to imply that Dēśing started on hearing of the death of Surup Singh. But what actually seems to have taken place, according to the narrative as a whole, is that the information of Surup Singh's illness reached his house in Bundelkhand. Rāja Dēśing left with his wife and a slender guard. While he was still on the way south, Surup Singh died when the son reached Gingee. Information of death reached Bundelkhand only then.

funeral ceremonies for his father and assumed authority as *Killadhār*. The *Killadhāri* officials of Surup Singh paid the *nazar* and acknowledged him as his successor, while the Padushayi officials, such as the *Dhaināth Vak Navis* and others did not pay the usual *nazar*. Knowing that Dēśing was a man of quick temper, nobody dared to intimate to him that he should not assume office without the orders of the *Sircar*. Payya Ramakrishna, the *Vak Navis*, however, found a suitable opportunity some time after to point out that he should assume office with the knowledge of the *Sircar* and with the orders of the *Padusha* where necessary Failing this, he urged that he ought to obtain orders from Nawab Sadat-ullah Khan.*

Dēśing replied that his father Surup Singh got the *meras* of Ginjee from his *Padusha* Alamgir, and therefore he was not bound to apply to anybody else, and nobody's orders were therefore required. Payya Ramakrishna kept quiet and six months passed.

Sadat-ullah Khan had information of the death of Surup Singh. But he did not send anybody to take possession of the government of Ginjee. He wrote to Rāja Dēśing, however, a letter of condolence about the death of his father. Dēsing was exercising his authority over all the taluks of Surup Singh's *jāghīr*. In the meanwhile, there arrived from the *Padusha* two *harkars* to Arcot (the head-quarters of the Karnāṭak since the days of Daud Khan) carrying a *firman* to Sadat-ullah Khan, and orders to Surup Singh (the orders that Faruksiyar issued in regard to the seventy lakhs of revenue due). Having read the *firman*

---

* See note above.

from the *Padusha*, the Nawab Sadat-ullah Khan called the Sheristadar of the Padushayi, Lala Todar Mall (Tamil Tondar Mull), and told him that Rāja Dēśing was an irritable young man and therefore to proceed personally to Ginjee and show him the *tākhid firman* and the letter from himself and take quiet possession of the fortress peacefully as well as the *jāghīr* lands attached thereto, and to send down Rāja Dēśing. Todar Mall left Arcot at the head of fifty horse and the necessary equippage and, reaching Ginjee, encamped himself near the temple of Venkatarāyaswāmi constructed by Muthiyal Nāyakan. The Padushayi officials of the fort, Payya Ramakrishna and others, came and visited him in camp. Todar Mall intimated to them that he was the bearer of the imperial *firman* to Nawab Sadat-ullah Khan and the *tākhid firman* to Killadhār Surup Singh. They examined the *Iṅāyatṅāma* and copies of the *firman* and conveyed the information to Rāja Dēśing*. Rāja Dēśing gave them the reply that the fort as well as the *jāghīr* attached thereto were given to his father by Alamgir Padusha, and that he was not prepared to give up the fort. Payya Ramakrishna in reply said that the *firman* from the *Padusha* and the *Iṅāyatṅāma* of the *Foujdār* were both of them brought to him by the *Mutsadi* who is encamped in Ginjee. Whatever Rāja Dēśing may have to say in this matter, he ought to speak to

---

* *Madras'ia Olden Times*, p. 327.

'*Thursday, October 8, 1713*. The present Nabob Sadat-ulla Khan, having received a firmaun from the new King Feroksere, confirming him in the Government of these parts; upon which the French and Ducth have presented him each to the amount of a thousand pagodas or thereabouts; and having lately received a message by a horseman from him, that if we do not forthwith deliver up the villages, he intends to come and take possession of them'.

him. He pointed out that Todar Mall was a good man as also was the *Foujdār* Sadat-ullah Khan. They assured him that they would not take away the *miraś* from him, but that, if he saw Todar Mall and the *Foujdār* afterwards, they would confirm him in the *killadhāri*. Payya Ramakrishna therefore impressed it upon him that he ought to go and see Todar Mall. Agreeing to this, Rāja Dēśing at the head of his horses and all the necessary equippage of his father went out riding towards the cremation ground of the Rājas near Mēlachēri. Turning round from there to the temple of Chakraperumāḷ on the banks of the river and turning towards the fort from there, the Rāja came to the tent of Todar Mall. Todar Mall, seeing that the *Killadhār* was coming, went forward to meet him. Dēśing made his salutation without getting down from his horse. Todar Mall felt chagrined and returned to his tent. Dēśing proceeded on his way to the fort. The next morning Todar Mall in his turn came on horseback and reached the court of Dēśing. Being a mild man, Todar Mall felt that he should not make much of the 'characteristic stupidity of the *Bundela*'. He approached Dēśing in due form and presented him the imperial *firman* and the Foujdār's *Iṅāyatṅāma*. When Dēśing got them read out to him, his eyes turned red and, becoming angry, he said that he would not allow the *jāghīr* to be taken possession of by Todar Mall. But, if he persisted, it would result in the rolling of many heads. So saying, he threw down the *firman* of the *Padusha* and the *Iṅāyatṅāma* of the *Foujdār* towards Todar Mall. Todar Mall took up the documents and returned to the camp. The *Foujdāri* officials followed him to the camp and wanted orders as to how they should

conduct themselves.* Todar Mall instructed them to go on as ever before in the discharge of their various duties and sent them back.

Toḍar Mall reported to Nawab Sadat-ullah Khan, the *Foujdār* of the Karnāṭak, that, if an attempt be made to take forcible possession of the fort, there is likely to be a fight for possession, and pointed out that Rāja Dēśing's confidence in the line of conduct that he has adopted was due to the possession of 350 horse of his own and 500 soldiers belonging to his *Killa*. On receipt of this letter the *Foujdār* set his army in motion and a skirmish took place in the plains of Timiri. In the course of a month, the *Foujdār*'s forces rose to 5,000 horse and ten thousand foot, besides contingents from Bangāru Yāchama Nāyaka of Venkaṭagiri, from the Nāyak of Kāḷahasti, from the Poligārs, Bommarāja and other *Killadhārs*, the whole army totalling thirty thousand, The *Foujdār* having collected

---

* On the matter under dispute the following extract from *Diary and Consultations at Fort St. George* for 1714 is illuminating. p. 143.

'I hope your Excellens will not disturb our quiet possession of Wt. w. formerly purchas'd wth. our money of the Lawfull Owner and has since been confirm'd to us by the Vizier Assid Cawn and his son in the name of the great King Aurg Zeb, and for wch. as well as for all our Antient Rights and privileges we have lately been hond. wth. his present Majesty King Farruckseers Husbulhookum as a token of his prncely grace and favour for the small unworthy services our people at Patna were able to do for him before he left that place to go for Agra. I have sent an attested Copy of this Royal grant to Latchmarow to lay before your excellency not doubts. but as we are always ready to do our utmost for his Majests Service, Your Excellency, will continue Yor. favr. and friendp. to us as usual, and command me in particular when anything offers for your Service, wt. can I say more.'

all the necessary material for carrying the campaign to the uttermost, arrived in Arni. He was met there by the *Killadhār* of Arni, Venkat Rao. Presenting the usual *nazār* and paying the peishcush, he joined the Nawab with his contingent. After fifteen days' stay, the Nawab broke up his camp and reached Chetput, the *Killa* of Salabat Khan, who met him and made the payments due. He was in camp there for about ten days when Todar Mall joined him. In Ginjee, however, Payya Ramakrishna, *Vak Navis*, and the other officials of the *Foujdāri* pointed out to Rāja Dēśing that the *Foujdār* was in full march with his own army and auxiliary contingents upon Ginjee, that the *Foujdār* was authorised to exercise control over all the *Killadhārs*, *Jāghīrdārs* and Rājas of the whole Karnāṭak and is authorized to receive tribute from them. 'Your father was given a *tākhid firman* for possession of Ginjee. It would not do, therefore, in disregard of all these, to persist in the course of hostility adopted by you. Even now if you would visit the *Foujdār* and pay your respects to him, he would recommend to the headquarters and obtain the *Killadhārī* for you. The *Foujdār* is actually seen at the head of a large force. It is for you to judge on the basis of these facts and adopt a line of action conducive to your interests.' Rāja Dēśing gave no answer to this remonstrance. The Nawab's forces emcamped at Kadalimalai and entered the territory dependent on Ginjee and set about plundering. The army gradually entered Ginjee. The forces of the Killadhāri did not oppose the *Foujdār's* forces. Seeing this, Rāja Deśing sent to his friend the *Killadhār* of Vaḻudāvūr, which belonged to the estate of his father, and obtained from him the assistance of

his son Mohabat Khan and two of his friends at the head of fifty horse. On the arrival of these, Dēśing got ready and mounted his horse. Those who were well inclined towards him pointed out to him that the omens were bad and that it was not proper that he should advance against the *Foujdār*'s forces. Declining the advice given, Dēśing went to his wife and telling her that, in case he should not return, she ought to find means to protect her honour. He sent word to all concerned that the army of the Muhammadans was approaching, and, telling those dependent upon him not to follow if they did not care, he set forward at the head of his guard on the road to Arcot. He was followed by 200 horses and Mohabat Khan. Without taking notice of any of the Nawab's forces that met them, they reached the banks of Varāhanadi, which was in full flood, as it was the month of October-November. After waiting there for just a short while, he spurred his horse into the flood, followed by Mohabat Khan and about a hundred horse, and reached the other bank of the river. The remainder of the force stood on the other bank alone. The river was not big and, even when it was in floods, it would be possible for them to cross it by waiting a few hours. But Dēśing had no consideration for these and marched forward at the head of a hundred horse against the Nawab's forces. Information of this having reached the *Foujdār*, he sent forward Dowlat Khan at the head of a contingent with instruction to fight him and capture him alive, and himself got ready and mounted his elephant. Dowlat Khan, seeing Dēśing approach at the head of a slender force of about a hundred horse, ordered his forces to spread out and surround the small force coming against him, himself approaching with

a view to capture Dēśing. Dēśing and Mohabat Khan attacked Dowlat Khan's forces, fought for some time vigorously till each of the forces lost fifty men. Of the followers of Dēśing a few fled. Mohabat Khan and his two friends stuck close to Dēśing and stood with him. They fought hard killing a number of the enemy, till they themselves were killed in their turn. Dēśing left alone was in terrible anger and wished to kill Dowlat Khan on the back of his elephant. Leaving therefore the Khan's main army, Dēśing rode up to his elephant. Dowlat Khan cried out to his forces not to kill Dēśing, but to capture him alive as that was the order of the *Foujdār*. So saying, he urged forward his elephant and made an effort to capture Rāja Dēśing. Finding an opportunity in the course of manœuvring, Dēśing urged his horse, which got on to the side of Dowlat Khan's elephant and rearing on its hind-legs, set its fore-legs on the side of the elephant. Dēśing simultaneously pierced Dowlat Khan with his lance and turning round quickly galloped to Ginjee. Even after the death of Dowlat Khan, the Nawab *Foujdār* still urged the soldiers to capture Dēśing alive and not to kill him, and moved forward with his own elephant. Dēśing, in his turn, urged his horse, charging the Nawab's elephant. One of the men on the side of the elephant cut off the fore-legs of the horse charging. The horse fell and Dēśing became a footman. Even after this the Nawab still would not permit his men to kill him and wanted that he should be captured alive. He urged his elephant forward and brought it near Dēśing. He was followed closely by Bangāru Yāchama Nāyaka on his own elephant similarly urging his men to capture Dēśing. One of the Jamadārs of this Nāyak,

holding his shield in front as a protection, approached Dēśing with a view to capture him. Dēśing transfixed him with his spear when Yāchama Nāyaka ordered that he be struck. One of the sepoys who was ready with his gun loaded and the wick burning, lighted the fuse and shot him dead. The Nawab entered the fort carrying the dead body of Dēśing with him in the year Jaya, month Arpiśi, date 2, corresponding to Fasli 1123, about an hour after sunrise (Sunday, 3rd October, 1714).*

The Nawab entered Ginjee and proceeding to the fort of Nazaratghaḍi in Padushabagh, and, having seated himself in the Kalyāṇamahāl of the late Surup Singh, saw that the treasury and places were secured and put under seal. All the officials of the *Padusha*, the officers of the army that followed him, other Amīrs and Rājas and the officials of the Nawab saluted the Nawab and presented him *nazar*. In the fort itself, the Nawab secured the Baratkhāna, the Chowkipāra and other places, and sent word to the wife of Rāja Dēśing and others in the palace of his assumption of government of the fort. Dēśing's wife sent back word that

* Saturday the 9th.—' General Letter from the Depty. Governr. and Council of ffort St. David, dated the 6th instant read inclosing their Accot. of Cash for last month, and advising that our Nabob had drawn all his forces Round Chingie & Summond Seroop Sings Son to surrender upon pretence of an order from Court to take possession of that place, which he refus'd to do & making a desperate Salley with about 300 Rashboots was very near killing the Nabob having cut the harness of his Elephant with his own hands, but timely Succours coming in to the Nabobs Rescue, Teja Sing Seroop Sings Son with Mohabat Cawn and Several others of the principal Men belonging to Chingie overpower'd & cut off so that it is beleiv'd Chingie will surrender in a few days.'

the Nawab was her father, and that she had no wish to continue life after the death of her husband, and requested permission to become *Sati* by ascending his funeral pyre. Finding her immovable from her resolution, the Nawab ordered everything being provided for carrying out her wishes, and gave her permission she sought. The cremation of the body of Dēśing and the immolation of his wife took place the next morning on the bank of the tank dug by Rām Shetty in the days of Rājārām. The funeral ceremonies were performed by the son of Alup Singh, a nephew of Rāja Dēśing, at the expense of the Nawab's treasury. The followers of Dēśing, the Nawab ordered, should continue to hold their places and remain as before. He however, obtained the permission of the Nawab to raise a new town at the spot near Kadalimalai, where Dēśing fell and, given a cowle therefor, they built a temple to Dēśing. They also built tombs for Mohabat Khan and the other Muhammadans who fell as well as to the horse of Dēśing. They recovered the corpses of Mohabat Khan and his two friends, and after burying them in the outskirts of Ginjee, built tombs over them on the bank of the Setty's tank. They built a flower garden where Dēśing was burnt and planted in the place a pipal and margosa. The *Bundelas* who were in the service of Dēśing obtained permission and returned to Bundelkhand. The Nawab took from Dēśing's Dewan Hanumāji Pandit, Tiruvēngaḍa Piḷḷai and others, charge of their offices and accounts, and sent them out as *Amils* of *Parganas*. He also settled the rents and the taxes after measurements, and granted *kavilnāma* to those of the *pētta* (heart of the town). He appointed as the *naib killadhār*, Sadat Tiyar Khan, his wife's sister's husband

along with a suitable *mansab* and *jāghīr*. The *Foujdāri* was given to Padanda Rao. To the new town that was built where Dēśing fell, they gave the name *Fateh Pett*. Paiyya Ramakrishna and other Padushayi officials were allowed to continue in their usual offices. He also appointed *killadhārs* and *mutsadis* as well as *sardārs* over Rājaghaḍi Krishnaghaḍi and Śēndarāyan Durga. He gave over Krishnaghaḍi to Kevutam Venkaṭapati, and, as usual, gave the *jāghīr* of Pennāttūr with it. For Bhūmikōtta he appointed as his Foujdār, Azam Ushān, and the office of *navīs* was given to Alkhayār. All were placed under the orders of Sadat Tiyar Khan, and in addition to the already existing *dhayināti* officials, he appointed Siyad Sultan, Abdul Karim, Hayat Khan and others as *Jamadārs*. The *killadhāri* was assumed temporarily by Sadat Tiyar Khan. The office of *Khazi* was given to Muhammad Ali, the son-in-law of the Padushayi *Khazi*, Shaik Abdul Khadar. They also built a Jamah Musjid within the fort and an Īdga right in front of the Śeṭṭipaḷḷam tank. It was such a splendid structure, the like of which 'is not likely to be seen elsewhere.' Dewan Lala Ray Dakhan Ray built a single storeyed mansion for himself with a garden round it. They also got the date of the capture of Ginjee cut out in a stone and had it built in on the steps of the Fātēh Darwāja. In this manner, Nawab Sadat-ullah Khan carried on the administration of the Karnāṭak for four years residing in the fort of Ginjee. Under the orders of the headquarters, he exercised authority over the governments of Sriranga-patam, Madura, Trichinopoly, Ramnad, Tanjore, Venkaṭa-giri, each under its own ruler. Besides the fifty-four *killadhāris* of the Karnāṭak, he had also authority over the

factories of Channapaṭnam (Madras) and Bhandar (Masulipatam). From all these he took the settled *peiskush* and collected the revenues of the *Khalsa* (state-owned lands). Finding at the end of the four years that the water of Ginjee did not agree with him, he made over his authority to the *Naib* (his deputy) and returned to Arcot.

[*Presented in the first instance to the Indian Historical Records Commission—Gwalior Session. Reprinted by permission with additional notes, etc., in the Journal of Indian History, Vol. IX. 1930.*]

Note on the term 'Dainatti'

In the article on 'Rāja Dēśing of Ginjee' in the *Journal of Indian History* for April 1930, one of the terms often used in its Tamil form was the term *Dainatti* as applied to one section of the forces under the command of the Killadhar of Ginjee, and (2) more generally to the officials of Killadhari office at Ginjee. In the Tamil form in which the term is used, I was not quite clear as to the actual form and the import of the term. I find now that that is the equivalent of the Persian term which has been used in the *Aini Akbari* and literature bearing upon Mughal administration generally. The *Mansabdars* seem to have been divided under the Mughal administration into two classes, *Hāzir-i-Rikāb*, that is, Mansab in attendance at court, and *Tā-i-natian*, those detailed for duty in the provinces. Troops as well as the civil officials attached to a particular *Mansabdari* seem to have been known by the name *Tā-i-natian* as distinct from the other group, those who attended at court,* and that seems the general sense in which the term is used in the Tamil documents relating to the history of Ginjee. Comparatively small detail as this is, it gives to the manuscript document something of a realistic touch that the term should be known in the form

---

* See Mr. Abdul Aziz: *Article on Shah Jahan*, p. 33 post

in the distant Tamil south, and at a period when Muhammadan rule was practically at an end in the locality. Perhaps this would enhance the value of the source from which the author of the manuscript drew for his information.

[*From Vol. IX, J.I.H., 1930*].

Diamonds in South India

The first systematic reference I have is in Kautilya's (Chāṇakya's) *Artha Śāstra* written probably at the commencement of the third century B. C. Treating of the Treasury Superintendent and his functions he has reference to six kinds of diamonds classified apparently according to localities of occurrence ;* mines, streams and other miscellaneous places are given as their sources. They are described to be of different lustre† and of various degrees of hardness ;‡ those also of a regular crystalline shape and those not so, of course described as inferior.§

---

* *Sabhārāshṭraka* found in Sabhārāshtra (Vidarbha country); *Madhyamarāshṭraka* found in the Central Provinces, (Maha-Kosala); *Kāsmaka* found about Kasma (Kasi or Benares) country; *Śrīkaṭanaka* found about the Mountain Kala; *Maṇimantaka* found near the Mount Manimān; *Indravānaka*. These six are diamonds–(Artha Śāstra). According to the commentator, Magadha, Kalinga, Surpaka, Jaladayasa, Paundraka, Barbara Tripuraka, mountains such as Sahya and Vindhya, Benares, the Mountain Vedotkaṭa, the country of Kosala and Vidarbha are the places where the diamond mines are situated.

† The various colours (or lustre) of diamonds are; that of a cat's eye, that of the flower *Śirishā* (Acacia Sirisa), the urine of a cow, the bile of a cow, *Sphaṭika* (calc spar), the flower of Malati, etc.

‡ The best diamond has the following properties, big, heavy, hard (*praharasahana*, capable of bearing blows), *samakōṇa* (regular in shape), *bhājanalēkhā* (capable of scratching upon the surface of metallic vessels), *kubhrami* (refractive of light), and brilliant.

§ Those without regular angles, uneven and bent on one side are inauspicious.

In all their description there is nothing to warrant the inference that diamonds were artificially cut ; but, perhaps, the fact that diamonds were used to bore holes in other substances makes it clear that lapidary work was not unknown.

Coming down the stream of time we have definite references in Pliny and the Periplus of the Erythræan Sea, both of the first century A.D. It will be seen in the references from Kautilya that, among the localities of occurrence mentioned, there is not a place further south than Vidarbha (Berar and Khandesh) ; but in these geographers of a later period there is definite mention of diamond as an article of export from the ports of Bacare and Neacynda, (both in Travancore).

These are ports a little to the southward of Cochin and diamonds being among the articles of export brings it within South Indian articles of trade if not among the products of mining.

As we all know South African Diamond Mines are a discovery of the nineteenth century—nay of the last decades of it—and according to Sir G. Watt, India was long the only source of diamonds known to European nations. There is so far no evidence of the transport of diamonds from Hindustan, and, as a matter of fact, the diamond mines referred to by Kautilya are most of them in the Vindhyan regions. There are references in Tamil Literature to a country called *Vajra Nāḍu* located on the banks of the Son river known to the Greeks as Herannabades (Hiraṇyavāha) with the alternative Sanskrit designation of *Suvarṇavāha* (Sone).

Did the diamonds which were exported from the western ports of South India, come from the north, or were they products of the south itself? It is just possible that they came from Northern or Central India, as another article of export from the same ports is described as 'spike-nard from the Ganges'. This view is the more probable as there was a great mart of eastern trade in Chōḻa Toṇḍi as opposed to the Chēra Tondi on the West Coast. The Chinese brought their cargœs as far as the Archipelago and perhaps even the Malaya Peninsula, whence the Malays brought it either to Ceylon or to the coast opposite. This does not, however, exclude the possibility that these diamonds may have been South Indian, as in fact other gems were, though there is no clear reference to the fact as such so far known to me.

Pliny derives *ádamas*, the word he uses for diamond, from *a* privitive, and *damas* to subdue, and says that it is not found in a stratum of gold (a notion formed from the locality of the occurrence of the two substances in close proximity in the Sone region), but in a substance of kindred nature to crystal, resembling it in transparency and its highly polished hexangular and hexahedral form (Diamonds are generally octahedral and Pliny may be pardoned the error having regard to the time at which he wrote and the Roman defectiveness in regard to their knowledge of diamonds). He knows enough, however, to note that these were turbinated in shape, and, to his astonishment, resemble cones set base to base. He knew them in size as large as a hazel-nut. In regard to its hardness he wondered that it set at naught the two most violent agents of nature, fire

and iron. He is simple enough, however, to retail the story that the diamond yielded to the blood of a he-goat when it was fresh, and when the diamond was fully submerged in it.

Tavernier, the later half of the seventeeth century, makes three divisions of diamond fields in his time :—

(i) The southern group dealt with by Mr. Sampat Iyengar, i.e., districts of Kadapa, Bellary, Karnul, Krishna, Godavari (Golkoṇḍa, etc).

(ii) The middle group-Mahanadi valley, districts of Sambalpur and Chanda.

(iii) Vindhyan conglomerates near Pana still worked.

The second group ought to be regarded as partly South Indian at any rate and that, includes the country of Vidarbha of the ancients; and that certainly is the only southern name that occurs in the list quoted by Mr. Sampat Iyengar for the *Maṇimāla*. Not much was known of this region in the days of Chandragupta and the ordinary description of it as *Mahākāntāra* (great forest) would preclude any knowledge of this part. Further the main arteries of communication between the north and the south appear to have avoided the central region and went close to either coast generally, though the sea-way would appear to have been the most familiar. In the days of Andhra ascendency, however, there is not the same justification for presuming ignorance of the localities here, and there seems to have been considerable activity in this region in search for gems, among them diamonds, as the names Ratnagarh, Manikgarh and Vijragarh would indicate. The

last at any rate figures largely among posssions much contested towards the end of the first millennium after Christ.

Nicolo Conti in the fifteenth century retails the story as regards the queer method of obtaining diamonds described by Marco-Polo, and Garcia-de-Orta (A.D. 1563) refers to the mines of Bisnagar (Vijayanagar) and Deccan (Deccem).

The story of poisonous snakes guarding treasure and infesting places where diamonds and other precious stones are found is the common stock in trade of story makers; and some such story is always heard in connexion with every precious commodity. That is not all. The diamond is said to possess virtues of a very extraordinary character, apart from those of its physical properties. The wearer of the diamond according to Sir John Mandeville, was proof against the witch and enchanter; it protected him against maladies and fiends and poisons,* etc.

It is clear from all this that diamonds in South India are not products of the mediaeval and modern periods alone

* Sir John Mandeville :—

'He that beareth the diamond upon him it giveth him hardiness and manhood, and it helpeth the limbs of the body whole. It giveth him victory of his enemies in plea and war, if his cause is rightful. And if any cursed witch or enchanter should bewitch him, all that sorrow and mischance shall turn to himself through virtue of that stone. And no wild beast dare assail the man that beareth it on him. And it healeth him that is lunatic, and then that the fiend pursueth or travelleth. And if venom or poison be brought in presence of the diamond, anon, it beginneth to wax moist and for to sweat......Nathless it befalleth often time that the good diamond loseth his virtue by sin, and for incontinence of him that beareth it. And then it is needful to make it to recover his virtue again or else it is of little value'.

at least there is the clearest evidence that the trade in diamonds was not; although, if it be true of diamond mining, the operations might have been comparatively speaking small. In fact it might have been that the diamonds picked up on the surface or quarried at great difficulty in one place or two would have constituted great wealth as could not easily be destroyed. If however, as Mr. Sampat Iyengar stated, the present day output should turn out very small it would be quite natural seeing that the trade has been going on for nearly 2,000 years and what is worse there has been immense destruction during the period of rival dynasties and bloody revolutions.

[*Remarks made in the discussion following Mr. P. Sampat Iyengar's lecture before the Mythic Society 1913. Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Vol. III. pp, 129–132.*]

Gollapallee Diamond Mines.

Sir Streynsham Master's account of the Gollapallee Diamond Mines.—The extract given below is taken from the Diary of the President of Council at Fort St. George, Sir Streynsham Master, who succeeded Sir William Langhorn as President of the Factory, and was in turn succeeded by Sir William Gyfford. The period of his office extended from January 1678 to July 3, 1681. The Diary here extracted actually refers to the dates April 20, 1679 to April 22, 1679. Master went to Masulipatam and places in the vicinity. Having completed his business of inspection and examination of accounts, he started on the return journey, and made a diversion from Madapollam to Ellore with a view to visit the diamond mines, which apparently were known to him, as Mr. Nathaniel Cholmley, another of the Company's servants, made purchases of diamonds in the mines for the Company. As is clear from the Diary itself, the road from Ellore to Bezwada passes through the mines at the foot of the hill to Mustabad, and thence to Bezwada, the whole mining area being covered by the road. There are many points of interest in the account of the mines as given by Master. This mine came into existence in 1670 first of all, was soon abandoned, and the license for mining here was renewed in 1673, when the other famous mine at Kollur had been abandoned, apparently owing to exhaustion. The licensing of this mine began soon after Abul

Hasan Quṭub Shah had established himself on the throne of Golkoṇḍa in succession to Abdullah Quṭub Shah. The description given of the mine, the processes of manufacture in the extraction of the diamonds, the public arrangements under which the operations of mining were permitted, and the mineral value of the industry as such—all of them come in for remark by Master. This detailed description challenges comparison with that given by Tavernier, who visited other mines in the vicinity, and not this one in particular, as this had not come into existence at the time Tavernier visited these mines. Tavernier's visit to the mine of Kollur, not very far off, and to that at Ramallakotta, just before that, both took place in the reign of Abdulia Quṭub Shah, the predecessor of the ruler who licensed actually the Gollapallee mines. The visit apparently took place in the fifties of the seventeenth century, actually before the year A.D. 1655, when he visited Mir Jumla at Gandikotta. What Tavernier has to say, therefore, of the working of the mines of Golkoṇḍa, both at Ramallakotta and at Kollur, both of them in the Kurnool District and its immediate neighbourhood, have reference consequently to the arrangements under Abdulla Quṭub Shah. Of course, Tavernier's account is not always reliable in every detail. He claims to be the first European to describe these mines, whereas three or four others before him,* have left accounts of these mines. He says in his account of the visit to Ramallakotta mines thus, 'I am able to claim that I have

* Cesare Federici, Methwold, Linschoten and Fryer, not to mention the anonymous Portuguese gentleman who visited Vajra Karur in 1610.

cleared the way for others, that I am the first European who has opened the route to the Franks to these mines, which are the only places in the world where the diamond is found.' A few sentences before, he mentions that he had been at four mines, the four being according to his account Ramallakotta (Ravalakonda in the Kurnool District); Coulour (Kollur or Gani Kollur now in the Sattanapallee Taluq of the Guntur District) and Soumeilpur in the Lohardaga District of Bihar. The fourth mine is not specifically mentioned by him, and has been identified with an abandoned mine near Damarapad and Malavaram where old excavations were visible when Ball examined the sites. So we see Tavernier travelled in about the same locality; but the actual workings at Gollapallee, as a matter of fact, came into existence after his time.

The details of the working, etc., he gives of the Kollur mines, which he visited, he describes in Chapter xvi of his work. He puts this down at seven days' journey east of Golkoṇḍa and says 'it was called Gani in the *language of the country*, and Colour in the Persian tongue.' From the description given of it, the place has been located correctly enough at Kollur, situated in the loop of the river Krishna where an outcrop of the Nallamalais spreads itself and provides a suitable ground for this industry. It is almost in the middle of a line drawn from Bellamkoṇḍa to Jaggayyapetta, and is in the Sattanapallee Taluq of the Guntur District. This was apparently called Gani Kollur, sometimes merely Gani, to distinguish the place from another Kollur lower down on the river Krishna, also called Kollur *in the language of the country*, that is by the

people, the language being of course, Telugu. The word therefore means a mine, as it is even in Kanarese, as one might say in the vernacular languages of the country, as the Kolar Gold Fields now are generally referred to by the name Gani. It is not a Persian word, as Tavernier, and even Sir William Crooke, the latest commentator on the work, take it. The word is neither Persian, nor is the construction of the word given correctly. It is in fact *Sans*. Khanin adopted into the Dravidian languages. In describing this mine, he speaks of a diamond of 800 carats; it is 900 *ratis* elsewhere, equivalent to 787½ carats. He further refers to the mine as of importance because of the unusually large number of larger diamonds that have been found there. He then goes on to describe the way in which the Indians examined the stones, and mentions that there were as many as 60,000 workmen engaged, including men, women and children, and notes that the working here was different from that which he noticed at Ramallakotta. The process of lixiviation, for washing the stones of the earth sticking to it, is given here differently. A space is enclosed by a short wall running round it with holes at the bottom for running off the water. All the diggings are carried into this place and water is thrown on the earth to soften first of all. After a day or two of this treatment, it is reduced to the consistency of a pulp; and then they pour more water and open the holes to drain off the water. Then again they pour more water to wash away the rest of the earth. They let it dry in the sun and after winnowing the dust, they pass on to the second process. They spread the gravel-like pebbles on even ground, and make it level. By means of wooden dampers they pound it and after winnowing again,

they sit down to pick the diamonds from among the gravelly pebbles. This differs, of course, from the process that Master describes in some particulars, and so far as these processes are concerned, they are bound to differ from locality to locality, according to the character of the soil from which diamonds are actually dug out.

In regard to the arrangements for mining itself, here is what Tavernier has to say, and it will be found that this differs to some extent materially from Master's description. The following is Tavernier's. 'I come to the government of the mines. Business is conducted with freedom and fidelity. Two per cent on all purchases is paid to the king, who receives also a royalty from the merchants for permission to mine. These merchants have prospected with the aid of the miners, who know the spots where the diamonds are to be found, take an area of 200 paces in circumference, where they employ fifty miners and sometimes a hundred if they wish the work to proceed rapidly. From the day they commenced mining till they finished, the merchants pay a duty of two pagodas per diem for fifty men, and four pagodas when they employ a hundred men.' 'These poor people get only *three pagodas per annum*, although they must be men who thoroughly understand their work. As their wages are so small, they do not show any scruple when searching the sand in concealing a stone for themselves when they go and dig naked, save for a small cloth, which covers their private parts, they adroitly contrive to swallow it.' This differs in two particulars from Master's narrative. The licensing fee that has to be paid is *two pagodas per diem* according to

Tavernier, but according to Master, it is *three pagodas per mensem* up to forty men, and four or five pagodas if more men are employed. In regard to the other point, their *annual earnings* are only *three pagodas per annum* according to Tavernier; Master notes that they receive *a pagoda and a quarter per mensem* in money and corn. What is more, he notes the appearance and condition of the worker as good by direct observation. Perhaps this second discrepancy may be explained away by taking it that the labourers received three pagodas per annum in cash, and grain for the rest of it, Tavernier noting down only the cash perhaps forgetting the grain. This is a little too much of a modification of the author's statement, and there are no grounds which would justify our assuming it. This objection to the assumption is strengthened by the statement that we find made in the Earl Marshal of England's paper presented to the Royal Society, London, published in 1677, just one year after the first edition of Tavernier's work itself. It would perhaps go to show that Tavernier's statement is correct for the period that he recorded, and for the particular mine to which it has reference. But unfortunately, we have no knowledge of the sources of information for the Earl Marshal's paper. It is generally taken that it is information supplied by Nathaniel Cholmley, who was employed for buying diamonds for the Company at Fort St. George. Cholmley was a contemporary of Master, and was engaged in this work at the time, to which Master's notes refer, and he left Madras at the same time as Master himself. If Cholmley were actually the source from which the Earl Marshal drew his information, it is much more difficult to understand the inconsistency of statement which

really becomes an inconsistency between Cholmley the diamond buyer and Master, almost his employer, who visited the mines at Gollapallee. The differences could not be altogether due to the differences of locality. One explanation seems possible and that is, Tavernier's statement refers to a period when Abdullah Quṭub Shah was the ruler, and the organization of the mines and their work were those of Mir Jumla; whereas Master's notes have reference to a mine that actually was licensed to be worked by Abul Hasan Quṭub Shah his successor, and the organization might be those of his ministers, Madanna and Akkanna. In such a case, the difference may be explainable as being due to a really more liberal arrangement under the new ruler who perhaps improved upon the rack-renting arrangements under the previous regime, and it may well be so, as the Gollapallee mines started work after the Kollur mines had ceased to yield.

The route by which Tavernier reached the Kollur mines presents problems, which are not perhaps quite capable of a final settlement as yet. We shall not take that up here, as in all the discussions in connection with these and even in the notes by Sir William Crooke, valuable as they are in very many particulars, no reference is made to the entry in the Diary of Master,* and hence it seems worth while drawing attention to this note of Master.

---

* *Diary and Consultations for* 1679–80 pp. 100–1.

Sir Richard Temple: *Diary of Sir Streynsham Master* II, pp. 170–77. The extract from the Diary appended is slightly modernized and punctuated for the convenience of the ordinary reader of the *Journal of Indian History.* (*Editor.*)

Extract from Streynsham Master's Diary.—Having finished what was thought necessary to be done in this visitation of these factories, in the morning about 8 o'clock, we set forward upon our journey to return to Madraspaṭnam intending to go the upward inland way and to make an elbow to take a sight of the Diamond Mines. We went this forenoon to Verasheroone * which is about 9 or 10 miles from Madapollam, those two places and Pollicull making a triangle. We viewed the Company's two houses at Verasheroone which stand one over against the other in one street, both of them part fallen to the ground, and that which stands of them it was not safe to adventure in to see them. The compounds of the houses are small but well situated, being raised high from the streets, above a mile from the town. There is a very large mango garden of the Company's by which the tent was pitched for us; but the Country Governors claiming the right to the fruit of the trees by reason we have neglected it, the Agent gave order to Mr. Hatton to send 4 or 5 peons from Madapollam every year about mangoe season, which is at this time of the year to watch the trees and gather the fruit to send to Madapollam, thereby to preserve the Company's right and title to the garden. There are also two other small gardens nearer the town belonging to the Company; but all lie waste, and only the great trees standing to shade the cattle and travellers from the sun. These with many others that

Miles: 9 Verasheroone.

---

* This is Vīravāsaram in Bhīmāvaram Taluq, Godavari District. Important Eng: Factory from 1635; only one person 1661; in decay 1668, and laid down 1674. Finally abandoned in 1702. (Temple Diaries of Sir Streynsham Master II, pp. 170–7.)

are (about) this town would very well accommodate weavers to work under, if the place were rented of the King by the Company* and kept under their government which was now adjudged to be for the Company's interest, keeping only a warehouse at Verasheroone, and the factory to continue at Madapollam. But the towne of Verasheroone is now ruined and empty of people through the tyranny of the Government.

22½: Pentepoll. In the morning by break of day we parted with Mr. Hatton, etc. the factors that came to accompany us thus far on our way, and about noon we reached Pentepoll† reckoned 2⅓ gentue leagues.

27: Elloor. We set forward early in the night, and by 9 or 10 in the morning came to Ellore 3 gentue leagues. This Ellore is reckoned one of the greatest towns in this country. The King in his last progress coming to see it, where are made the best carpets after the manner of those in Persia, by a race of Persians who they told us came over above 100 years ago. the manner of making them we saw, and is in brief thus; the loom is stretched right up and down made of cotton threads and the carpet wrought upon them with the woollen yarn of several colours by young boys of 8 to 12 years old. A man with the pattern of the work drawn upon paper stands at the back side of the carpet, and directs the boys that work it, how much of each colour of yarn should be wrought in. Every

* Marshall gives a similar account in his notes and observations of East Indies: (*Diaries of Sir Str: Master*, Ed. by Sir Richard Temple II, p. 170, n. 3.)

† Penṭapād in the Tanuku Taluq, Godavari District.

thread being wrought they shear or cut in with a pair of scissors and then proceed to the next.* At this place a horse of the Company's which we took with us from Madapollam falling lame, we left him here with one of our Englishmen and a peon to return to Madapollam.

At Ellore we lodged in a house of Aga Jalal's whose brother-in-law prepared us victuals, and gave us hens and sheep, to whom for his kindness and, in respect to Aga Jalal who married his sister we presented three yards of scarlet at parting.

Easterday ye: 13½ Gollapallee ye: Diamond Mines.

About two o'clock in the morning we set out of Ellore, and about 7 arrived at Gollapellee† upon the Diamond Mines and lodged in the house where Mr. Cholmley made his investment of diamonds the last year. In the afternoon about 4 o'clock we went to the mines about a mile and half out of town upon a hill to see them dig and look for the diamonds, which is done after this manner; the ground is loose, of a red fat sand and gravel, great and small, black, red and white stones.‡ One or two of the miners loosen the earth with an iron *grow*,§ and others with iron *pawraes*¶ or spades have it up to a heap

63 miles.

* Ellore still maintains this reputation for its carpets.

† Gollapallee in the Nuzvid Zamindari 25 miles N.-E. of Bezwada. See Madras Presidency Sheet Atlas, Sheet 3.

‡ The pits are in gravelly laterite resting on sandstones' according to Biligrami and Wilmott's *Nizam's Dominions*, I, p. 234.

§ Error for crow used for crowbar in the 17th century.

¶ This seems another vernacular expression for a digging apparatus more or less like a crowbar, a big, long pick or pike.

from whence others with baskets wind the small dust from it with the wind. Thence it is carried to a trough made up of stones and earth, and filled with water which is brought thither above a mile upon men's heads where all the gross earth is washed away from the gravel; for the earth melts like sugar, and runs out of a hole with the water, so the gravel is all that remains. That they carry thence and spread upon a smooth flat place prepared for the purpose. There the same men (that dig, dust and wash the earth), sit all the heat of the day in a rank one by another with their faces towards the sun, looking for the diamonds. And the man that employs them sits over against them, to see that what they find they deliver to him. In this manner they find the diamonds in the same fashion and shape as they are sold rough. By what we observed the cost and labour of finding them countervails the value and worth of the diamonds. Those that employ the miners do not buy the ground as some have reported; but they and any one that has a desire to employ his money that way first acquaints the governor of the mines with it. Then he grants him license to spring a mine where the employer thinks best, paying 3 pagodas per mensem if he employs no more than 10, 20, 30 or 40 men in it. If more, then 4 and of some 5 pagodas per mensem.* The miners or those labourers that work in the mines are paid 1¼ pagodas per mensem in

---

* In the mines at Ramallakotta, according to Tavernier, 'the merchants pay a duty of *2 pagodas per diem* for 50 men, and 4 pagodas when they employ 100 men.' (Tavernier, Crooke's Edn. II, p. 46.) According to Thevenot, 'the king exacted a pagoda every hour they work there whether they find any diamonds or not.' Quoted in Biligrami and Willmott's *the Nizam's Dominions* II, p. 505.

money and corn,* and this is all the charge the adventurer in the mines is at, except it be that they overbid one another sometimes for a good piece of ground which one hath lighted upon, and another hearing of it bids the governor money for it and he that gives most has it. But besides the rent of 3 to 5 pagodas per mensem to the governor for the king there is a custom or excise set upon all corn at about 50 per cent above the market; upon salt, betel and tobacco at above double and treble the market rate. All the miners and those that deal there (except a privileged Englishman or such like) are compelled to live upon the mines in those towns where that excise is raised. The town of Gollapallee though within a mile and a half of the mines is without those limits, and therefore none of the miners or dealers in diamonds are allowed to live there, but at Mellwillee†

---

* 'These poor people only earn 3 pagodas per annum, although they must be men who thoroughly understand their work.' Crooke's Tavernier II, p. 46.

† This name appears ss Mullally in sheet 94 of Indian Atlas. The following extract from the Earl Marshal's paper of 1677 in the Philosophical Transactions gives the history of the mines. 'Melwillee or the new mine, so called because it was but lately found out (for at least permitted to be made use of) in the year 1670, it had then a year employed the miners, but it was forbidden and lay unoccupied till 1673, when complaints being made at Quóleur (Kollur), that the vein was worn out, the king again licensed its settlement. The earth they mine in, is very red and many of the stones found there have (some) of it sticking to them, as if it had clung there while they were of a soft glutinous substance and had not attained that hardness, maintaining its colour on its skin (to be roughened with it) that it cannot be fetched out by grinding on a rough stone with such seeming, which they make use of to clean them The stones are generally well-shaped . . . most of them have a thick dull skin, incline to a yellowish water not altogether so strong and lively as the other mines, very few of them of a crystallized water and skin. (Temple; Master's Diary ii, pp. 173–4.)

about 4 or 5 miles from Gollapallee, where the governor of the mines lives. The whole rent of these mines is reckoned to the King worth 60,000 pagodas per annum, and as much more to the governor to bribe the courtiers to hold the place. There was none of the mines that we saw this day which were dug above three feet deep from the surface of the earth, and most of them about two feet. The ground first overgrown with shrubs and bushes which the miners dig up with the earth. These mines lie upon a flat hill upon the top and on the side of it, where are found small and great diamonds of good and bad waters but very little bort,* and they say that the adventurers in these mines seldom lose in their undertakings.

This morning came several of the most eminent merchants from the mines to visit us at Gollapallee, and to try how we were inclined to buy. At first they asked moderate rates, which when we bought they raised and afterwards would not shew more but what they asked dear for, so we could not lay out 1,000 pagodas amongst us all for fear of injuring the market. At 3 in the afternoon we set out of Gollapallee, passed over the mines to Mellwillee and Raizpent† which is about 6 miles, almost all that ground being spread with miners. And the mines in the valleys were much deeper than those upon the hills, being some of them 10 and 12 feet deep, and some mines were sprung upon ground where corn had been sown and reaped a few months

* Diamonds of a quality too coarse to be fit for jewellery.

† These places are neither of them found in the new Indian Atlas issued by the Survey of India. Temple gives reference to sheet 94 as stated above, but the Atlas with me does not show it; nor does the Route-Map of the Madras Presidency in sheets.

since. The governor of the mines at Mellwillee sent to compliment the Agent and excuse his not coming out to meet him as he said he intended to do, to which a civil answer was returned. The two towns at Mellwillee and Raizpent upon the mines are very large and populous; but the buildings all thatched hovels. The people are well favoured, well clothed, and look as though they fed well to undergo their great and hot labour. The corn etc., being at excessive rates,* the place must needs be full of money to pay 30, or 40,000 labourers in the mines besides many others, the diamonds being also always bought with ready money. The country pleasant like England about London; by Raizpent is a large pleasant green valley full of flocks of woolly sheep; thence to Mustabad† where we lodged this night, we travelled through a mountainous country, by very pleasant valley with tanks of water, and came to our journey's end about 8 at night, having travelled two gentue leagues.

Mustabad.

Supplementary Note on Mullavelly.—'A village near Ellore. It belongs to the Nizam who, in ceding the Circars, specially reserved the villages in which diamonds are found.

'Diamonds are found in its vicinity. Some account of the geology of the place is extant, from which the following

* Ball notes: 'We are told in the Earl Marshal's paper that in Golkoṇḍa, the miners and merchants were much oppressed, and in a miserable state of poverty, from having to submit to tyrannical squeezing and heavy duties on provisions, tobacco and betel.' (Crooke's Tavernier II, p. 354.) If Mr. Nathaniel Cholmley is to be given responsibility for this statement, how is this to be reconciled with Mr. Master's?

† A station on the railway line between Bezwada and Ellore in the Nzuvid State.

extract may be offered : "Near the village the plain is strewn with blocks and fragments of a very hard conglomerate sandstone, some pieces of which are of a purplish colour. There are also some large blocks of garnetic gneiss, in a state of decomposition ; but the red sandstone abounds most, although rolled pieces of quartz, with a covering of a ferruginous clay, or carbonate of iron, together with the conglomerate sandstone, are scattered over the plain. The hollow flat, where the diamond pits are excavated, is surrounded by a bank, or rising of the soil in a circular manner. It has the appearance of having been once a lake. The banks are formed of the red ferruginous sandy soil, prevailing all round the place. Through this plain no river or rivulet flows, and the pools in its lower part, dry up about the month of March, when the excavation may commence, and not before."

'A few hills in the vicinity lie to the northward, not above two or three hundred feet above the plain, and are covered with underwood, interspersed with large trees. Some miles beyond these hillocks runs another range, loftier than the nearer ones, having however the same direction.'

'The diamond pits are in general excavated at the north end of the bank that surrounds the hollow, to a depth of not more than twelve feet. The strata penetrated during the search for diamonds, are a grey, clayey, vegetable mould, about a foot or two thick ; below this an alluvium composed of the following pebbles (not including the diamonds) which have evidently undergone attrition, their angles having been worn off ; sandstone, quartz, siliceous iron hornstone, carbonate of iron, felspar, conglomerate

sandstone, and a prodigious quantity of *kunkur*, or concretionary limestone. Besides the numerous pieces of this concretionary rock, scattered on the surface of the soil, and also intermixed in large quantities in the diamond alluvium, it forms regular strata or veins in a horizontal position, both in the vegetable earth, and in the diamond alluvium, precisely like flints in chalk. Many of the pebbles of quartz, and hornstone, are not only varnished as it were, with a ferruginous *enduit*, but it penetrates into their substance.'

'The *kunkur* contains not a trace of quartz, or any other mineral; and that in strata, in the vegetable soil, and in the diamond alluvium, is more friable than that exposed on the surface of the ground. It is in this alluvial detritus that the diamonds are found. The diamond is never found imbedded, or in any way attached to any of the pebbles, with which they are invariably associated in this locality. They are always found loose, mixed with other little stones, and never attached to *kunkur*. The pebbles most constantly associated with it, and forming infallible indications of the existence of diamond, are iron ore and hornstone.'

'Notwithstanding the prodigious quantity of carbonate of lime in this locality, the water does not contain any traces of it; and the inhabitants use even that collected in the pits. The detritus, forming the diamond stratum, must proceed from the hills north, the only ones near this place; being probably the continuation of the standstone range which extends easterly from Banganapilly,

Condapilly, and Mullavelly, in all of which localities the matrix of the diamond lies in conglomerate sandstone.'

[*Note.*—The above is an extract from *Pharaoh's Gazetteer of Southern India*, pp. 56 and 57. This work was published in 1855 and the condition of the mining locality about that time is what is reflected in the quotation.]

[*This was presented to the Indian Historical Records Commission in December last at its Patna Session, 1930, and is published here by permission.*]

An Incident in the Relation of the Governor of Poonamallee with Fort St. George.

The early history of Fort St. George is full of stirring incidents of various kinds and degrees of importance; one of them that is of particular interest is the administration of the settlement during the period of rule of the surrounding locality by a certain Governor of Golkoṇḍa, generally known in the Company's records as Brahmany Lingappa. Before we come to this particular incident, a very brief resume of the history of Fort St. George would be necessary for the understanding of the incident.

The region in which Fort St. George is situated fell within the sphere of the operations of Golkoṇḍa under the arrangements come to between Golkoṇḍa and Bijapur after the defeat of the Vijayanagar armies in the battle of Talikota. The English had their trading settlements at Masulipatam and Armagam within the territory of Golkoṇḍa and the Dutch had their settlements at Pulicat. In the period of commercial rivalry and war between the Dutch and the English, the English found their position at Armagam uncomfortable as against the Dutch at Pulicat on the one side and even the Portuguese at San Thome on the other. The position at Masulipatam itself did not ensure freedom to the Company's servants to the extent that they required it for their own as well as the Company's trade. Hence there was

a general dissatisfaction with the position. By the constant efforts of Cogan and Day, they succeeded ultimately in securing possession of a somewhat neglected piece of ground in the neighbourhood of what was called Madraspaṭnam, and a charter was apparently issued by the Vijayanagar Emperor, Venkaṭa II, through the influence of the Governor of Kāḷahasti, Vengaḷa or Venkaṭa and his brother Aiya, sometimes called Aiyappa. This is the foundation of Fort St. George. This charter was lost and is not forthcoming even now, and the East India Company's Agents provided themselves with an efficient substitute for it by a renewal of the charter by Venkaṭa's successor, Śrīranga, the last ruler of Vijayanagar. This was issued in 1645, and was written on a plate of gold. That constitutes the basis of the settlement.

There the settlement is clearly described as in the immediate neighbourhood of Madraspatam. It is there that the name Madraspatam occurs for the first time authoritatively. The reason for that particular name is still shrouded in obscurity, and what circumstances it is that gave the name to the locality is yet very far from clear. Another name of the Indian town is what occurs sometimes in the Company's records as Channapaṭnam. This town owes its foundation to the family of Kāḷahasti chieftains whose representatives at the time were Venkaṭa and Aiyappa referred to above. It is the second of these princes that built the town in the name of their father, Channappa with the special object of preventing the Dutch at Pulicat and the Portuguese at San Thome from fighting against each other constantly by interposing a town belonging to the emperor between

these two settlements of European trading companies.* This Channappa was ruler of Kāḷahasti, and his family and those of his relations, the Velugōṭi chiefs, played an important part in the history of the last days of Vijayanagar Empire. The town of Channapaṭnam therefore was an earlier foundation built by Aiyappa, son of Channappa, whose name figures as Aiyappēndra in the account of a battle fought at Erode by a number of allies on behalf of the emperor, Śrīranga, against Doḍḍadēvarāja Wōḍēyār of Mysore. Channapaṭnam therefore was an old town; Madraspatam seems to be a town or a part of this town with another name Madraspaṭnam ; and it is in the immediate neighbourhood of it that the land was actually given to Cogan and Day to build their settlement.

In the Fort St. George records there is clear evidence of confusion between the one and the other, and sometimes they are spoken of together, sometimes the one is substituted for the other. But that they were two is kept up distinctly in the various charters, even in the charter obtained from the Nawab Neknam Khan in 1672. But this statement is put beyond a doubt by the statement of Butche Paupama, the great granddaughter of this Channappa, ruler of Kāḷahasti. The letter is reproduced in Love's Vestiges of Old Madras, Volume I, page 347. She speaks of Channapaṭnam as having been built in the name of her grandfather's father. Col. Love makes a mistake that she was the granddaughter, as she is described as the daughter of a Timmappa. There is a Timmappa among the sons and there is also a Timmappa among the grandsons of Channappa. Her

* Source Book of Vijayanagar History, Extracts 93 and 95.

statement ought to be given preference in a case like this. That the town of Channapaṭnam was built by Aiyappa in the name of his father is again categorically stated in the report of the Brahmin Venkaṭapati, the Company's Agent at Golkoṇḍa, who wrote about it in January 1672.*

The charter that was granted by Śrīranga had to be renewed again by the Nawab, Mir Jumla, when he became Nawab of Golkoṇḍa Carnatic in the fifties, and subsequently by the Nawab Neknam Khan at the end of the reign of the Kuṭub Shah, Abdullah, and just before his successor, Abul Hasan, came to the throne. In all these charters the position of the town is defined and the privileges more or less fully enumerated. But the question of privileges was so worded as to admit of considerable doubt. The town was made free of customs for the goods of the Company. But as the town improved, the commercial activity of the settlement also improved, and with it naturally sea-going trade both by way of exports and imports. All the goods that came to it were not the Company's necessarily, and that provided one fruitful cause of dispute. Another was that the rent originally agreed upon was a comparatively small sum when the settlement was of no importance whatever as a commercial centre. But as its position improved, its finances naturally improved, and the imperial power of whom the Company held the town naturally also looked to improving their part of the share. Then there was the question of the surrounding people, who went and effected settlements in Fort St. George and within its limits. They consisted of artisans, and labourers of various kinds, spinners, weavers,

* Love's Vestiges of Old Madras, Vol. I, p. 346.

dyers, etc., and contributed largely to the prosperity of the town. Their position in relation to the Company on the one side and their leige lord on the other was one of considerable delicacy. Then there was the question of intercourse, commercial intercourse in particular, between the town itself and the surrounding country in respect of supplies of various of the daily requirements of the settlement. All these necessarily provided fruitful ground for quarrel and the disputes assumed more vigour or less as the governor of the surrounding locality happened to be a man of vigour as an administrator or an easy-going individual.

It is in this connection that we find the Tarafdār of Poonamallee, to which belonged Channapaṭnam and Fort St. George, figure prominently in the Company's transactions. When the last Kuṭub Shahi ruler, Abul Hasan, succeeded to the throne, he appointed two Brahman brothers, Madanna and Akkanna, as the Dewan and the General Agent respectively. The Muhammandan Prime Minister died; and the Muhammadan Commander-in-Chief was dismissed, another Muhammadan in favour with the Brahman brothers taking his place. The Nawabship that was held by Mir Jumla became soon after the charge of Akkanna, Madanna continuing to be the Chief Minister. As Abul Hasan is reputed to have given himself up to a life of ease and enjoyment, the real power was in the hands of these brothers, who seem to have had a certain number of nephews of great talent. One of them figures in the records of the earlier transactions by name Rustam Rao. Similary Lingappa figures in the records of the East India Company as the energetic Governor of Poonamallee, who tried to get from

the Company at Fort St. George a due share of its revenues for the Government at Golkoṇḍa.

Akkanna and Madanna have been handed down to ill-fame because of the paucity of knowledge among historians.* Even from what little is known of them, they seem to have been officers who conducted the administration on lines of efficiency, and served their master's interests loyally. Of course, like the governors of these times, even including the public servants of the East India Company, they had a partiality for private gains, a feature from which knighted agents of the English Company were not free among the contemporaries of these. This defect notwithstanding, there is enough to show that the administration of Golkoṇḍa was more or less efficient and Aurangzeb found it a very difficult task to destroy the Sultanate ultimately.

In regard to Lingappa, the information that is available in the Company's records have been so interpreted that even historians have strayed away from their impartiality and committed themselves to verdicts which could not be accepted as altogether historical. The following extracts from Talboys Wheeler's History of Madras would illustrate our position :—

"It will occasion but little surprise to learn that the spirited defence offered by Mr. Streynsham Master to the intrigues of a deceitful native like Lingappa, should have

* Even Professor Sarkar's Aurangzeb contains but little regarding them beyond the statement of *Havart*. More is known of them even from the Company's records, which is naturally coloured by the prejudice against Lingappa.

excited a strong opposition to his measures in the breasts of the Directors at home. Indeed we are sorry to say that the latter exhibited a meanness of spirit, which strongly contrasts with the volunteer movements of our own times; and they were perfectly willing that their servants in this country should succumb to every petty native chief who chose to insult them, or who endeavoured to worry them into sending *peishcush*." *

The first part of the extract here refers to the high-handed doings of Streynsham Master between the Company and its servant ended in the Company's ordering the retirement of their energetic Agent in Fort St. George. The dispute had reference to the rent due from Madras, Lingappa demanding, in view of the growth of the town and its revenues, a higher rent than the paltry one that was fixed upon to begin with, and the inclusion or otherwise of Triplicane in settlement. When the Company refused to consider the question fairly from the point of view of Lingappa, he took such coercive measures as to stop the trade, the source of prosperity of the Company in the town. Streynsham Master took it into his hands to send out expeditions into the immediate neighbourhood, set fire to towns, burn and pillage villages, and even went the length of burning down the house of the *talayāri*, the chief of the police, in Triplicane itself. I am not sure that such acts of an Agent come within the description of the latter sentence of Talboys Wheeler's in regard to the doings of Lingappa. Master undoubtedly succeeded for the nonce, but the

* J. Talboys Wheeler, Madras in the Old Times (1882 Edition), p. 63.

resources of Lingappa were great. He was apparently an energetic official, had the countenance of the chief officers at headquarters, two of them being his own uncles. As he pathetically pointed out that as Tarafdār of Poonamallee he had to pay a heavy tribute to headquarters, and latterly when he became Governor of Conjivaram and ultimately rose to be the Viceroy of the Golkoṇḍa Carnatic, a position occupied by the great Mir Jumla himself, he demanded what he thought was a fair quota from his point of view from Fort St. George. Seeing that the response was not reasonable enough, he resorted to coercive measures by merely declaring a blockade. Streynsham Master's reprisals took the form indicated above. Having regard to the resources of the Company at the time and the possibility of Streynsham Master's bringing on war with the kingdom of Golkoṇḍa as a whole, whether the East India Company was right or wrong in regard to their censure of the action of Master, no historian could doubt.

But even for Lingappa there was a case, and that it was not merely the private greed of the individual that was responsible would become clear from the following letter that he wrote to Governor Gyfford on his arrival in Madras. The letter speaks for itself. All we wish to point out here is that Lingappa must have been a man of energy and a capable administrator to have been promoted from a mere Talukdār of a small divison like Poonamallee to the governorship of the Carnatic, and he must have served loyally; and if he went forward against Bijapur and Mysore at the time and conquered for Golkoṇḍa the Subha of Sira in Mysore, one of the divisons conquered

for Bijapur by Shahji, Shivaji's father, which constituted an integral part of the territory of Bijapur at the time, he could not have been the petty native chief that he is described to be. *Peishcush* and the desire for it may have been the canker that ate into the Indian administration just as private profit and petty speculations of various kinds did that of the British Company, as successive Governors of British India have time and again insisted. Sir William Langhorn was not free from it in Madras and one of the good things that Streynsham Master did as Governor of Madras was to put an end to private trade of the Company's servants.

From this lengthy letter of Lingappa it will become clear that far from being a petty official, whose one object was the demand of *peishcush*, he was a rather vigorous administrator and worked for getting from the Company, what, from his point of view, was the legitimate income for his masters, the rulers of Golkoṇḍa. The Company's Agents and their servants put up a struggle, not very much for the profit of the East India Company, as for their own private profit. A careful examination of the Fort St. George records themselves would indicate clearly that in this struggle perhaps the merits were on the side of the Golkoṇḍa Governor rather than the East India Company's servants. The verdict of Talboys Wheeler noted above is hardly supported by the known facts.

Translation of a letter, dated July the 10th, 1681, (received July the 14th, 1681) from Podula Lingappah from Conjivaram, to The Right Worshipful William Gifford, Esq., Governor.—I enjoy good health wishing

to hear the life from your worshipful; the kind letter you were pleased to write to me I have received the same in a good hour the contents whereof I have perused and joyfully observed. I have had notice of your arrival at Chinapatnam the 3rd current, and you have written me accordingly, whereof I heartily rejoiced. I was informed that you have been sometime before at that place and have been very kind and have done a great deal of good to many people, and now it has been a matter of a year that the people hearing of your coming out all have waited for your arrival as the pearl oysters for the rains in October; and as that sort of fowl called Ehuccuroculoo waits for the rains from the clouds; and as the dry fields wait for the rains; and were continually looking towards the sea, wishing for your safe arrival as an afflicted people; and by the great fortune of the people, you have arrived there safely as well for their happiness as your own business.

The action of the late Government as follows, *viz.*, I, unto whom the Diwan has been pleased to deliver their chop, was ordered to remain in these parts on their behalf; but the late Governor never took any notice of what I used to write to him, and there coming the king's phyrmaund and Braminy Maddana and Achana's Roccas, and the Diwan's to your town, he would take no notice thereof, but turned them away. The town of St. Triplicane does belong to Poonamallee country, for Verona* being a person that used to do a great deal of charity and having desired to let

* Kasi Viranna, sometimes also called Hasan Khan, was the Company's native agent for trade.

him have the place at farm we let him have it since which I, having sent our people to take possession of it, they were thrust away, and besides when Braminy Achana came to these parts he did not send to visit him nor vouchsafe to write him a humble letter. And besides he has proclaimed that none belonging to your town shall lend any money or offer to buy any paddy of any person belonging to the country under our Government. And if they did, they should be severely punished and many the like things. Notwithstanding all this, considering that strangers of great quality trading into this country and many people being maintained by them and those that live under you did do great deeds of charity; for these reasons I have winked at it as much as I could. He has laid a tax upon all the inhabitants of your town, and has taken from several of them money by force, and fined several others and done many other things which they being not able to endure any longer, left the town and came away expecting to have a cowle granted them and Company's Merchants should leave the place; and came to live with them, it being a custom among the caste of this people, that if some should refuse to do as the rest, to make a kind of mutiny; and thereupon the people of the caste have hindered the carrying of any merchandise to your town; but the late Government seeing this sent about one hundred soldiers and two hundred peons towards St. Thome and Poonamalee and fell upon the town, robbed them and carried away the goods.

One son of a whore, a traitor and a murderer called Serapa, the late Governor's crediting that pitiful fellow's

words that made him believe saying that the Golkoṇḍa people, had no horse, nor men and that they should not do the country any greater harm for god's sake and that if the English, did intend to take all the whole country who could hinder them; and when the late Governor did write to me, he did use to write as a master to his servant with many threatenings and many the like things; my master had notice of all these words and he was pleased to write to me saying that it was true that the English had farmed that town for 1,200 pagodas per annum, that it was likewise true, that we have only given the cowle for their European ships and the Company's goods and not for the goods that are bought and carried from this country upon such ships as come from Acheen, Pegu, Bantam, Manilla, Arakan, Malacca, Ormus, Tanasery, Orissa, Bengal, etc., places; and that we did not give them the *Juncan* thereof freely to them ; it is not only this but St. Thome, did use to produce us 10,000 pagodas per annum, but by the great dissatisfaction we took against the French we razed that city to the ground ; but all the people belonging to that place came to your town and therefore we lose that 10,000 pagodas per annum ; and besides this they have kept and protected in your town such merchants as came from great places, as Poonamallee, Chingleput, Conjivaram, Kaveripak, who did use to pay the Diwan certain taxes and thereby the English get a great deal and that whether or no the English had a phyrmaund for all these things and why the Diwan should lose all these benefits for farming the town to the English for 1,200 pagodas per annum ; and therefore ordered me to endeavour to make the English give satisfaction for all these losses, and the money those people owe the Diwan, the

English must either pay it, or if not willing to do it, they must be gone to their own country and that such insolent people should not remain in this king's country and this he writes to me, but I considering it would be a great affliction to the people, I have only prohibited merchandise and permitted provisions to be carried to your town ; but the late Governor being a very understanding person, and Serapah being his favourite and councellor took it very ill. I should do so and sent and robbed Candore and intended to cut off the chief *talayārī*, head of that place, but he being there with a few people (he made his escape).

Mr. Hearsey having desired me leave to get goods brought from St. Thome which he intended to have shipped for Manilla ; but the late Governor having sent some people there (lacuna in the original) fetched the goods to Chinnapatam by force and besides that there being a Jaffnapatam vessel coming to St. Thome, the late Governor prepared a vessel and having shot several guns ; the men that were upon this vessel being much surprised and afraid, endeavouring to get away, some of them fell into the sea and were drowned ; what became of some of them, it is not yet known, but that boat was carried to Chinnapatam road, riding in St. Thome road which had brought palmirahs from Jaffnapatam, they cut her cable and carried her likewise to Chinnapatam having also kept a couple of sloops in the St. Thome road, and fired off guns with a design to lay hold of all the boats that were bound thither and therefore all the merchants that were there, left the place for fear and went away.

His Highness the Allumpanah* has sent me a phyrmaund saying St. Thome was a great road and therefore I should name the place Hassennabaud, and should endeavour to increase the place as much as I could, a person of my king having graciously looked upon it, the late Governor did endeavour to ruin it as much as he could. But how long should I suffer it.

The Diwans did grant their cowle for Chinnapatam and not for such persons as the late Governor to come further into the country and therefore to prohibit our country people from going to that place; I have only kept a few people about 3 or 4,000 round about your town with a design that the English imagining that Golkonda's people had but these soldiers, the English would sally out upon our people.

And whereas you are now come with a design to do good to all people I do not doubt but you will act so that there will be nothing done to the Company any prejudice; but all people to live contentedly (*sic*) and your trade and merchandize to go on well; and I hope all things will proceed prosperously when the Diwan lays hold on anything, they will not easily part with it and how do you design to please them.

My master writes to me that the late Agent had sent by Dubash Grua 2,000 pagodas for a present and 12,000 pagodas that remained due and by the means of Honasser the said money was delivered into my master's treasury and he writes he has received the said money and that he only

* Alam Panah, Protector of the World.

received the money but was not fully satisfied therewith and whether or no you or they must not pay the money for Chinnapatam as much as Pulicat produces ; and if the English should say they have their cowle, I should give for answer that they should only remain there themselves and the Company's merchants in the town, and should deliver us as Pulicat people did, all the St. Thome merchandize and of other places of our country which are there and all other caste which are in your town and that, excepting Europe ships, all other ships and vessels that come from all other places, should come from the Diwan's port and not yours.

Moreover, he wrote me that by the unjust proceedings of the late agent. I should fine him in great sums of money and hereafter to keep a good correspondence between him and me.

You write me word to permit merchandize and provision to be brought to your town ; I shall not fail to do it. I shall not do contrary to your desire therein ; it is very good for me to have friendship with so noble and discreet a person as you are, desiring not to esteem as a small friend, for in time you will come to be satisfied in my friendship ; I do serve one for a little victual and I must obey what I am commanded by my master and therefore if you would send one of your persons and to empower him to do so as shall please my master, all things will go on very well and thereby you will obtain great honour. What need have I to enlarge any farther to so discreet and understanding a person as you are.

You may lay your commands upon me desiring the continuance of your love.

[*N.B.*—The letter is partially modernized and punctuated; otherwise it is left as the literal translation of the original.]

[*A paper read at the Eleventh Public Meeting of the Indian Historical Records Commission, held at Nagpur in December 1928.*]

PART II

INDIAN CULTURE

destruction of the great charioteers of the enemy. The next statement refers to the Pāṇḍya who helped Arjuna to rid himself of the curse of Vasu.*

The next following statement is that he drove the enemy kings into the desert, so that they may be destroyed. This is a general statement, where he is said to have defeated other kings, and drove enemy kings into desert as the only safety from his pursuit. This is the usual Tamil expression meaning that the enemy could find no freedom from the victor except by fleeing into the desert for protection. The next is a more definite statement. It is the imprinting of the Pāṇḍyan royal emblems of the time on the face of the Himālayas. This is a claim that is often made by Southern kings, all three of them, at various times. The Southern monarch that is said to have carried his arms successfully so far as the Himālayas, must have been overlord of his two colleagues in the South, and if the Pāṇḍya happened to be the overlord, his authority is generally taken to have been acknowledged by the Cōḻa and Cēra, and the emblems of the three together constitute the imperial Pāṇḍyan sign-manual. This is said to have been imprinted on the Himālayas as a sign that the Pāṇḍyan suzerainty had been acknowledged right up to the Himālayas in the north. In historical times a similar claim was made by Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I right up to the banks of the Krishna.

* This is, according to the *Mahābhārata*, prince Babhruvāhana, Arjuna's son by the Pāṇḍya princess Citrāṅgadā, who fought against him and defeated him in the course of Arjuna's peregrination preliminary to the celebration of the horse-sacrifice. The story will be found in chapters 70-82 of the *Āśvamēdhika Parva* of the *Mahābhārata* (Kumbhakonam edition).

His inscription in Poonamallee shows the combined emblem of the three kingdoms similarly. The claim here made is ascribed actually to the Pāṇḍyan hero* of the *Śilappadhikāram*. A victorious march up to the Himālayas has similarly been claimed by the Pallava Simhavarman in his Amarāvati inscription,† and by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III.‡ Although we cannot be very definite as to the particular individual who achieved this distinction, having regard to the fact that these rulers were in the habit of appropriating such extraordinary achievements of their ancestors to themselves, the reference here seems to be to the one who made claim to this for the first time. Since the hero of the *Śilappadhikāram* is described as the Pāṇḍyan Neḍumśeḷiyan, victor over the Aryan army, it seems likely that this is the person under reference here.

The next following statements deserve careful scrutiny. The first has reference to the vast work of repairs to irrigation tanks carried out by a Pāṇḍyan ruler not with the assistance of human labour but with that of demons. Of course, the work must have been stupendous and must have been carried out as a measure of famine-prevention. The next following incident is similar in point of character, that is, destroying hunger in the kingdom of the Pāṇḍyas. Apart from poetical language, this could only mean that the particular Pāṇḍya concerned took steps to give relief to his people at a time when they were bound to suffer

---

* Book XVII, lines 1-5 and the Epilogue to Book XXIII.

† *SII.*, I, No. 32, ll. 29-39.

‡ Sanjan Copper-plates of Amōghavarṣa: *Ep. Ind.*, XVIII, No. 26, V. 23.

from hunger owing to the failure of crops in the country as a result of famine. He is said to have got rid of hunger by measures which are not specifically stated, and to have brought this relief work of his to a conclusion by raising "a picture that was painted in gold". This latter part has been coupled with what follows in the Epigraphist's translation, which makes *Citramuyaṛi* a battlefield like Talaiyālangānam, But the language used actually is that he got the country rid of a killing-hunger, and raised the golden picture, as if to say that the removal of the hunger was brought to a conclusion by raising this picture.

How could the raising of the golden picture complete, even ceremonially, the removal of hunger? It would be clear even to superficial readers that this item and the previous one, the large scheme of repairs to irrigation tanks are actually measures of famine-relief. If that be so, is there anything like the raising of a golden picture that could be connected with famine-relief measures; whether anything like the raising of a picture is symbolical of what was actually done? It is nothing more than the celebration of the famous festival to Indra, which brings to a fitting conclusion the vast efforts of the ruler to keep famine out of the country, if his own efforts could do so. That festivals to Indra were largely in vogue in India, we can presume from the familiarity with which comparisons are drawn to *Indradhvaja* and other details connected with it in literature. In the *Śilppadhikāram*, one whole book is devoted to this Indra festival, which seems to have come to a close on the full moon of Caitra, the first month of the Tamil year. The self-same festival is referred to in the

opening book of the *Maṇimēkhalai* as a normal condition of affairs in a Tamil city like *Kāveripaṭṭiṇam*, the Cōḻa Capital. That it was not confined to the Tamil country alone, we may presume from the reference to it in the third verse of the fourth *sarga* of the *Raghuvaṁśa*, where the ladies of the city with their children came to see the coronation procession of Raghu.* In commenting on this verse, Mallinatha explains what the Indra festival under reference was, and gives us some details as to its celebration. The term *Puruhūtadvaja*, the festival of the raising of which is brought into comparison with the coronation procession of Raghu, is explained by the commentator as the festival celebrated by kings with a view to the timely fall of rain. He gives three *ślōkas* in explanation thereof, all of them probably from the *Bhaviṣyōttarapurāṇa*. The first one† defines the flag as having the form of an elephant, raised on four posts, and fixed up standing in front of the city-gate. 'In this manner the inhabitants of the city celebrated the festival of Indra in the rainy season'. In a second verse,‡ he gives another definition. The Śakradhvaja is four-sided, in the form of a flag, and fixed in front of the royal-gate of the palace. 'This, people call 'the flag of Indra', and brings health and happiness to the people of the city'.

---

* पुरुहूतध्वजस्येव तस्योन्नयन पंक्तयः ।
नवाम्युत्थान दर्शिन्यो ननन्दुः सप्रजाः प्रजाः ॥—रघु, ४. ३.

† गजाकारं चतुस्तम्भं पुरद्वारे प्रतिष्ठितम् ।
पौरा कुर्व्वन्ति शरदि पुरुहूत महोत्सवम् ॥

‡ चतुरस्रं ध्वजाकारं राजद्वारे प्रतिष्ठितम् ।
आहुः शक्रध्वजंनाम पौरलोके सुखावहम् ॥

Another verse* quoted in the context explains the purpose, and the verse is addressed to Yudhiṣṭhira. Whoever is the king that carries the flag of Indra in festival procession, in his kingdom the clouds pour the amount of rain wished for, without a doubt. Thus it is clear that the raising of this flag connotes a festival to god Indra with a view to an abundance of rainfall at the proper seasons of the year, and the celebration is a festival conducted by kings. This is exactly the description which we find given of the festival in Bk. V of the *Śilappadhikāram*, and the first book of *Maṇimēkhalai* as well, in both of which it is explained as taking the flag on which was a representation of the Airāvata, Indra's elephant, from the front of the building in which is placed Kalpavṛkṣa (the wish-giving tree) of Indra with the eight auspicious signs, and taking it round in festive procession. This festival begins with the announcement by the big drum, placed in the hall dedicated to the Vajrāyudha (the thunder-bolt) of Indra, carried on the back of one of the royal elephants, and the festival announced by beat of drum both when it begins and when it closes, in the temple hall where the image of the white-elephant, Airāvata, is housed. It is not explained so fully in the corresponding portion of the *Maṇimēkhalai*, but in substance it is the same. It will be seen from this detailed description that the festival was actually a celebration in honour of god Indra with a view to obtaining rain, and all the features associated with the festival are features in close association with Indra and his royal

---

* एवं यः कुरुते यात्रामिन्द्रकेतोर्युधिष्ठिर।
पर्जन्यः कामवर्षी स्यात्तस्य राज्ये न संशयः ॥

heavenly paraphernalia, his characteristic weapon, the Vajrāyudha, his special mount Airāvata, his special tree Kalpaka and the flag, all of them alike symbolising the coming of Indra, to which the *Maṇimēkhalai* adds the statement (I, ll. 5-15) that, in the days when the great festival of Indra was being celebrated in Puhār, the capital of the Cōḻas, by special permission of the god, Indra's heaven itself became empty, and all the gods came down to the Cōḻa capital in various forms to witness the great festival.

The point for explaining the passage in the grant consists in this. That the particular Pāṇḍyan under reference undertook active measures to prevent famine as far as human agencies could provide for it, and assured himself of unfailing timely rain, without which all human efforts would have been in vain, by celebrating this traditional festival to bespeak the good offices of the rain-god Indra. The two statements therefore together constitute work that was done in connection with one particular object, and must be so taken in our interpretation of the passage.

Then follows a series of three statements. The first is the achievement of a Pāṇḍyan, who won the victory at Talaiyālangānam, where, on the field of battle, he cut off the heads of the two other crowned kings like himself, and stopped the dancing of the headless trunks. Without all the poetical embellishments, it simply means the two kings, the Cōḻa and the Cēra whoever they were, were killed in the battle. The next statement is the doing of the *Mahābhārata* in Tamil, and the next following statement is the establishment of the Śaṅgam in Madura. Of course, the passage comes to a close with the statement

that, after these great kings and *Sārvabhaumas*, or emperors, had ruled and passed away began another series of rulers. The purpose of the grant in doing this is to indicate that when these rulers of old who lived and passed away so gloriously, another set of rulers of modern times began to rule in succession. This manner of stating it gives indication of a comparatively long interval between the one set and the other.

The really interesting question in respect of this passage is whether we should ascribe each one of these events, or achievements, to a separate ruler, or whether some of these have to be taken together and ascribed to one and the same ruler. This turns out to be of importance particularly with reference to the last three of them. We have seen already that in respect of irrigation-works, and the celebration of the Indra festival, we would be justified in taking the two together as the work of one and the same ruler. Similarly one may be inclined to take the two incidents connected with the *Mahābhārata* together; but that is hardly called for as the active assistance in the war may be the work of a Pāṇḍya sovereign who might even have fallen in battle, from the way that his part in the war is described. The victory that Arjuna's own son won against his father betokens a comparatively young ruler, and, having regard to the additional fact that Arjuna married the princess in the course of his *Tīrthayātrā* he must have come to the throne later in succession to the other. The next one is a general statement, the defeating of contemporary kings which may be ascribed to one Pāṇḍyan of distinction, and may even be common to several. We have pointed out that the imprinting

of the Pāṇḍyan emblem on the Himālayas, whether it is actual or merely poetical, is ascribable to a particular Pāṇḍyan from whom, of course, his successors could have assumed it, as is often the case, without any achievement to substantiate it. Then follows the one distinguished for the famine-works referred to, and then comes the next one, the victor at Talaiyālangānam. The Pāṇḍyan victor at Talaiyālangānam is a famous figure in so-called Śaṅgam literature of Tamil, and the victory at Talaiyālangānam is itself under reference by a number of poets of the first rank among those regarded as poets of the Śaṅgam. First and foremost there is the Madurai-kāñji of Māngudi Marudan included in the Śaṅgam collection called Pattuppāṭṭu (*Ten poems*). This poem of 850 lines is in celebration of this Pāṇḍyan whose exploits are described in full, and the purpose of the poem is to draw his attention to the necessity of providing himself for the life to come, having done all that need be done by a sovereign on earth to discharge his duties and make himself famous. Then the great poet Nakkīrar refers to him in some poems ascribed to him. But in one, *Ahanānūṛu* 36, there is a full and unmistakable reference to the battle, and to the seven enemies whom he had overcome. Their names are enumerated categorically as the Cēra, the Cōḻa, the chief Titiyan, the chief Eḻini, the chief of Erumaiyūr, the chief Irungoveṇmān, and the chief Porunan. These seven are referred to allusively in the *Madurai-kāñji*. Another poet Kurungoḻiyūr Kiḻār refers to another achievement of this Pāṇḍya, his taking the Cēra 'prince of the elephant-look' prisoner in poem 17 of the *Puṛanānūṛu*. In poem 19, the same poet addresses the same sovereign, and the poet refers by name to the Cēra

prince 'of the elephant-look' in other poems, making him undoubtedly a contemporary with him. Another poet, Kallāḍan addresses this very same Pāṇḍyan in poem 23. There is a similar reference to him mentioning specifically his Cēra and Cōḻa enemy in poem 25 of the same work. So then we see that the Pāṇḍyan, who was victor at Talaiyālangānam against the two other enemies and a number of chiefs, their allies, is actually celebrated by poets, whose names undoubtedly figure in the traditional lists of the Śaṅgam as they have come down to us, and whose works are undoubtedly included in the collection known as the Śangam collections. Poem 18 of the *Puṟanānūṟu* exhorts this Pāṇḍya to make his territory well provided with irrigation works. Can we, therefore, identify him with the Pāṇḍya who is mentioned in this charter, as having distinguished himself by similar works and celebrating the great Indra festival?

There would be justification for identifying this Pāṇḍyan with the Pāṇḍyan victor at Talaiyālangānam, as poem 19 by the same author refers unmistakably to the battle of Talaiyālangānam, in which he is said to have overcome the seven enemies. Taking the two poems together, it leaves us in no doubt that the poet Kuḍapulaviyanār does celebrate the Pāṇḍyan to make the food supply abundant in the country by providing irrigation works. This would, therefore, warrant our taking it that, according to the charter under discussion, it was he who took steps to get rid of hunger from his country and celebrated the Indra festival as a fitting completion to his benevolent work. If so, then it amounts to this; that the Pāṇḍyan victor at Talaiyālangānam at some time in his reign, felt the urgent necessity for

embarking upon large irrigation works and providing the country with the means for raising an ample supply of food and putting it beyond reach of famine.

We then proceed to the next incidents, the doing of the Mahābhārata in Tamil, and the establishment of the Śaṅgam in Madura. So far as the doing of the Mahābhārata is concerned, we have definite information regarding three versions of the *Mahābhārata*. The latest is what is popularly known, and in popular use, as the *Mahābhārata* of Villiputtūrar, sometimes spoken of as *Villiputtūr Āḻvār*, supplemented by a comparatively modern writer, Nallā Piḷḷai. This is the complete version of the work we have. The next is a version of which we have not as yet come upon even a complete manuscript, but of which portions are available covering three or four *parvas* from the Udyōgaparva. The part available has recently been published, but it is only a part. Even so, it gives us the information in one of the verses included in the published part that the work was composed in the reign of Nandivarman of Teḷḷāru, whom we know as the Nandivarman, grandson of the great Nandivarman Pallava-Malla of the eighth century. The work therefore is referable to the middle of the ninth century after Christ. The name of the author, however, is Perumdēvanār. This Perumdēvanār has often been mistaken for the Perumdēvanār, whose name figures in the so-called eight Śaṅgam collections, for the eight of which he composed the poems in invocation. This would mean that it was in his time that the collections were actually made, and that it fell to his lot to compose the poems in invocation; and he composed the eight poems to Śiva, Viṣṇu, and Skanda or Subrahmaṇya, according to

occasions, showing a broad-mindedness in matters religious, fairly a general feature of the times. We find the name Perumdēvanār among the list of writers compiled from the Śaṅgam works, and there is at least one poem among the collections by a Perumdēvanār, which probably was in those days a common name. To distinguish, therefore, the particular Perumdēvanār who translated the *Mahābhārata* in Tamil, he is always referred to as the Perumdēvanār who wrote the poem Mahābhārata in Tamil. That is, he is generally distinguished as the author of the Tamil *Mahābhārata*. Quotations from the *Mahābhārata* occur in the classical grammar *Tolkāppiyam* and elsewhere, for purposes of illustration. These have been collected to the extent of about forty verses, and several among these are not found in the part so far published of the Bhārata of the more modern Perumdēvanār whose work is distinguished by the name *Bhāratavenḅā* indicating the metre of the verses in the poem. It seems clear, therefore, that we have to look for another Perumdēvanār who rendered the Mahābhārata in Tamil, and composed the poems in invocation for the eight collections of the so-called Śaṅgam works in Tamil. Can we refer the rendering of the Mahābhārata in Tamil by this author as under reference in the expression 'the putting into Tamil of the Mahābhārata' in the charter under examination? This will become clearer in the next section where we shall take up for consideration the establishment of the Śaṅgam in Madura.

According to the traditional account of the Śaṅgam, that is really the only account that is available so far, there were three such Śaṅgams. It is by the maintenance of a court of learned men, it is hardly necessary to give these

Śaṅgams any stricter organisation than that as far as our information of them at present goes, that the Pāṇḍyas encouraged the growth of Tamil literature, and made it possible for the comparatively large output of Tamil literature at the period. In the course of the progress of this literature, a famine is said to have supervened and, lasting for the proverbial twelve years, made life in the country impossible. The ruler for the time being, finding it difficult to maintain such a large court at a time of such great distress, dismissed them all by allowing them to scatter themselves elsewhere than in the Pāṇḍya country during the time of distress, and return immediately that the famine ceased. The famine having lasted perhaps longer than was expected, those who returned were comparatively few, and among them it would appear there was nobody who had cultivated that part of Tamil grammar relating to love, one of the five main sections of Tamil grammar. The Pāṇḍya ruler at the time finding that the court was so denuded of scholars of eminence made a systematic effort to collect the poems, as far as he could arrange it, the best among them with a view to putting them in a permanent form. The eight collections of works generally called by Tamil scholars Śaṅgam works had been thus made in his time. He was however much exercised about grammar or *Lakṣaṇa Grantha* for one important section, and offered a prize for one who would compile an abbreviated work on that subject. Finding no one came forward to do the work, he did not know what exactly to do, when just under the seat of the god in the great temple at Madura, a set of copper-plates was discovered containing a work on that subject in sixty *sūtras*. This work had necessarily to

be commented upon and all the poets who then happened to be at court were asked to comment upon the work. Six such commentaries were presented and were submitted for approval to the dumb child of a Brahman regarded as an *Avatār* of Skanda or Subrahmaṇya. Of the six commentaries, the young umpire approved in part of that by a scholar by name Madurai Marudan Iḷanāgan. The commentary of Nakkirar received far greater approval, and that got, therefore, incorporated with the *sūtras* and has come down to us. So says tradition in regard to the work known as the *Iṛayanār Ahapporuḷ*.

The dumb prodigy who did this miraculous work was the person who collected, probably later in life, the 400 poems on love comprising what is known as the *Ahanānūṛu*. As we stated in the paragraph above, the work of collection must have begun earlier, and must have led to the discovery relating to the lack of that particular section of Tamil grammar. Whether all the collections were completed then or later we have no indication for certain. But that this collection was made by this Brahman, Rudraśarman, son of the rural celebrity Uppūrikuḍi Kiḷān is clearly stated by the commentator on the work, and it is followed by the further statement that he made it for the Pāṇḍyan Ugrapperuvaḻudi, who must, from the name itself, be regarded as a separate, and, in all probability, the next succeeding ruler to the other mentioned in the preceding paragraphs. That this is so is confirmed by the fact that the poems in invocation for the *Ahanānūṛu* as well as all the other collections were composed by *the* Perumdēvanār who achieved his fame by rendering the Mahābhārata in Tamil. So the rendering of the Mahābhārata in Tamil by

this author must have preceded his composing the poems in invocation for the collections. The collections therefore must have been completed at a time subsequent to his achieving the great reputation by doing the Mahābhārata in Tamil.

We thus come to this conclusion as a result of our investigation of the passage in the large Śinnamanūr copper-plate charters issued by the Pāṇḍyan king Rājasimha who had the title Mandara Gaurava, son of Parāntaka Śaḍaiyan (Sans. Jaṭila): the first Pāṇḍyan mentioned in this passage is the Pāṇḍyan who played an active part in the war of the Mahābhārata. The next one is the prince Babhruvāhana, son of Arjuna himself. Another Pāṇḍyan seems to be under reference, victor over contemporary monarchs, perhaps because he achieved the hegemony in the Tamil land. Then we come to the Pāṇḍyan who imprinted the combined Pāṇḍyan emblem of the three kings, fish, the tiger and the bow, on the Himālayas. This may be the same as the one above, and may be the Pāṇḍyan 'victor over the Aryan army'. Then follows one to whom, as we have arranged it, the following achievements are credited: the great scheme of putting in repairs innumerable irrigation-tanks, thus putting his kingdom beyond reach of hunger and celebrating the achievement by a great festival to Indra. The next achievement of his is the killing of the two contemporary monarchs in battle at Talaiyālangānam. Then the doing of the Mahābhārata in Tamil. Then the establishment of the Śaṅgam in Madura. While the passage gives no indication which is manifest, that these were the achievements of a single ruler, we have shown reason why these have to be ascribed to a single monarch on the evidence of the Śaṅgam works themselves,

which must be regarded as contemporary. Thus the Pāṇḍyan victor at Talaiyālangānam seems clearly to stand out as the celebrity who did these things. The person responsible for the drawing up of the charter saw good reason to stop there in his recital of the ancient Pāṇḍyas. We do not know exactly why. He passes on to the more recent dynasty, the reigning ruler of which at the time conferred a charter upon a learned Brahman.

The charter is datable in the middle of the tenth century A.D., as the Pāṇḍyan donor of the charter seems to be certainly the ruler who was overthrown by the conquering Chōḷa Parāntaka I, A.D. 906-955. We cannot investigate in this paper how many generations backwards from him are actually known to us on the authority of the copper-plate charters, and what interval came between these and the ancient Pāṇḍyas under advertence. We must reserve that investigation to another occasion. But we may state here roughly that the historical Pāṇḍyas known from these charters take us through thirteen generations as the epigraphist has arranged it on his genealogical table, taking us back through four centuries and bringing us to the second half of the sixth century. We have shown reason for a long interval, an interval of two to three centuries between that and the flourishing period of Pāṇḍya rule* and the last Pāṇḍya referred to here must belong to a period in the second or third century of the Christian era.

[*Reprinted from the Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. IX, 1933; M. M. Haraprasad Sastri Memorial Number.*]

* *Beginnings of South Indian History*, p. 240 ff.

Celebrities in Tamil Literature

Prefatory Notes :—I propose to give in the following papers a brief notice of what can be gathered from Tamil literature, so far brought out, of those that have attained fame either as poets or as patrons. I owe the idea to Dr. Hultzsch, Professor of Sanskrit at the Halle Universitys of attempting a catalogue on the lines of Dr. Aufrecht's great work. Having neither the ability nor the opportunities of the late eminent savant, I held back for over two years. I now venture upon the task, since no one else has come forward to do it. As a starting-point for such a work, which must necessarily be chronological at least in part, an attempt is made to fix in the following paper the *probable age of the third Tamil Śaṅgam.* In the succeeding papers, I shall give an account of what I have been able to gather regarding the Śaṅgam and post-Śaṅgam celebrities, as far as I can. The attempt must necessarily be tentative in character and it is hoped it will eventually lead to a better knowledge of the literature of the ancient Tamils and their history.

I. The Augustan age of Tamil Literature.—Dreary as the prospect may well appear to the earnest student of Tamil literary history, as in fact does early South Indian history in general, there has, of late, been brought to light a considerable body of Tamil literature which throws a flood

of light upon the much-doubted, though often debated, period when literary activity in Tamil reached its high water-mark. Scholars are much divided in opinion as to the Śaṅgam having ever existed at all except in the active imagination of later poets and the idle tongue of tradition. This is not strange, considering how much truth is generally overgrown and interwoven with fable and legend. Whether wantonly or otherwise, the truth is very often hidden almost beyond recognition in later literature; and early scholars in modern Indian research have unwittingly contributed their own quota to the very same end. Much has, therefore, even to be unlearnt before making an attempt to learn something about this distant past of the oldest of the Dravidian languages of South India. Even in the traditions handed down to us much distorted though they are, there are certain cardinal facts and characters standing clearly marked out from the rubbish outgrowths. It will not, therefore, be without, interest to attempt to place these facts in the light in which they appear, on an unbiassed and impartial enquiry.

An attempt will, therefore, be made in this paper *to set forth the available evidence*, literary and historical, which tend *towards the following conclusions* :—

(*a*) That there was an age of great literary activity in Tamil to warrant the existence of a body like *the traditional Śaṅgam.*

(*b*) That the period of the greatest Śaṅgam activity was the age when *Śeṅguṭṭuvan Śēra* was a prominent character in politics.

(*c*) That this age of Śeṅguṭṭuvan was *the second century of the Christian era.*

(*d*) That these conclusions are in accordance with what is known of the later history of South India.

There are a number of works in Tamil literature of a semi-historical character of a later and of an earlier time; and these alone will be relied upon here, without altogether eschewing tradition of a reliable character, as the sequel will amply shew. So far as tradition is concerned, there had been three Tamil Śaṅgams * that flourished at or about Madura and of these the third is all that we can presume to speak about. This Śaṅgam had for its members 49 critics and poets who constituted a board of censors. There were 49 Pāṇḍya rulers, among whom were *Muḍattirumāran and Ugra Peruvaḻudi* who actively patronised the Śaṅgam. The last personage is the sovereign before when the *Kuṟaḷ of Tiruvaḷḷuvar* received the Śaṅgam imprimatur. It is not out of place to remark here that the author of the *Kuṟaḷ* was not among the Śaṅgam members, and there were a large number like him at different places, as will appear in the sequel.

Taking this Ugra-Pāṇḍyan for reference, a number of poets and kings could be grouped around him from evidence of contemporaneity without having recourse to any legends concerning them. But it is first of all necessary to shew that it is *probable that Tiruvaḷḷuvar was a contemporary of Ugra-Pāṇḍyan.* Apart from the verse in praise of the *Kuṟaḷ* ascribed to him it is a well-known fact that

---

* The Poem quoted at page 2, *note.* *Śilappadhikāram.*

Tiruvaḻḻuvar had a sister by name, or rather title, *Avvaiyār*. The poetess sings of this same Pāṇḍyan and his two friends the Cōḻa Kiḷḷi, who performed the *Rājasūya*, and the Chēramān Māvaṇkō, although the names of these personages are not mentioned as such in the poem 367 of the *Puṟanāṉūṟu*. But poem 21 of the same collection by Iyūr Mūlangiḻār, specifies his victory over Vēngaimārban and the taking of the 'great fortress of the forest (Kānappēreyil).' It also refers to the fame of this Pāṇḍyan transcending the skill of poets. This Ugra-Pāṇḍyan is credited with having got the collection *Ahanāṉūṟu* made. Certain mythical achievements are ascribed to one Ugravarma Pāṇḍyan in the *Madura Sthalapurāṇa* and the *Hālāsya* or *Tiruviḷayāḍal Purāṇam*, which achievements are alluded to in the 'Epic of the Anklet.'*

Leaving aside Ugra-Pāṇḍyan for a while, the greatest of Avvaiyār's patrons—in fact, almost the patrons—were *Adiyamān Neḍumān Anji* and his son, *Pohuṭṭeḻina*. Their territories were in the modern Mysore province and in the Salem District, with the capital at Tagaḍūr,† identified with Dharmapuri in the latter district, though there was another Tagaḍūr of some consequence in later history in the Mysore District, not far from Nanjanagūḍu near Mysore town. There was an Adiyamān, about the same

* *Śilappadhikāram*, Canto xi., ll. 20–31.

† Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai identifies this place with Dharmapuri, Salem District. *Vide Epigraphia Indica*, VI. No. 34, and *ante*, XXII, pp. 66 and 143. Mr. F. J. Richards, M.A., I.C.S., informs me that a hill overhanging the town Dharmapuri goes by the name "*Avvaimalai*," the hill of Avvai.

region who, as the Cōḻa viceroy, was driven across the Kāvēri when Talakāḍu was captured by the famous Ganga Rāja, the general of Vishṇuvardhana Hoyśāla before 1117 A.D. Of the many poems in the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* collection ascribed to Avvaiyār, the great majority celebrate Anji, one of the last 'seven patrons of letters,' as patronage went in those days, Several of these mention the hero and his son by name. Poem 91 gives the hero's name and refers to the gift to Avvaiyār of the black gooseberry supposed to confer immortality on the lucky eater thereof. The same incident is referred to, with the name of Avvaiyār put in it, in the poem *Siṟupāṇāṟṟuppaḍai** of *Nallūr Nattattanār* included in the 'Ten Tamil Idylls' another Śaṅgam collection. The poem has for its special object the celebration of Ēṟumānāṭṭu Nalliyakkōn, a petty chief over Vellore, Amur and other places near about, as the most liberal among the liberal patrons of those days, *viz.*, the Cēra, the Cōḻa and the Pāṇḍya, and the seven last patrons. Poem 99 of the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* is of importance, as giving us another clue to a different synchronism of the utmost consequence. This poem celebrates Anji's conquest of Tirukkōvilūr and states that the hero's fame transcended the capacity of the poets of an older generation, and yet the poet *Paraṇar* 'sings today of the glory of your conquest of Tirukkōvilūr.'

This mention of *Paraṇar is of very great importance to literary history.* He was a poet among the Śaṅgam members and is credited with a large number of the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* collection. But Paraṇar's fame should have been greater, had he really enjoyed the patronage of

* ll. 99—103.

Śeṅguṭṭuvan Śēra, whom he celebrated in the fifth division of another Śaṅgam collection, the 'Ten Tens' (*Padiṟṟup-pāttu*). The parentage ascribed to Śeṅguṭṭuvan there agrees word for word almost with that given by the author of the 'Epic of the Anklet,' a brother of the king, and is even fuller of particulars. The last verse, the *Padigam*, written either by a friendly contemporary or disciple or some one else in a similar position, explicitly gives us the names of the hero and the author, and thus leaves us in little doubt as to the correctness of the connection. It is on these two accounts that the commentator of the latter work relies for his fuller account of the Cēra's history. From the reference to the *Śiṟupāṅ* made above, it is clear that Avvaiyār enjoyed the patronage of Adiyamān Neḍumān Anji. Poem 99 of *Puṟanānūṟu* refers to Paraṇar as having celebrated the same patron. The last verse* of the fifth division of the 'Ten Tens' connects unmistakably Śeṅguṭṭuvan with Paraṇar. Thus then it is clear that *Śeṅguṭṭuvan Śēra, Adiyamān Anji, Avvaiyār and Paraṇar must have lived* if not actually at the same time at least *in the same generation.* Śeṅguṭṭuvan was a remarkably great ruler, and thanks to the efforts of our modern 'Nachchinārkkiniyār,' Mahāmahōpādhyāya Pandit Svaminatha Iyer of the Madras Presidency College, we have two great works composed at his court and in his time, which shed a flood of light on contemporary history and which would go a long way in settling many a knotty point in the literary history of South India. These are the 'Epic

---

* *Vide* page 10, footnote on page 11, and Canto xxix. Pandit Svaminatha Iyer's edition recently published, pp. 68—76. *Śilappadhi-kāram.*

of the Anklet' (*Śilappadhikāram*) and 'the Jewel Belt (*Maṇimēkhalai*). The first is the work of *Iḷango*, the younger brother of Śeṅguṭṭuvan, who, after renouncing civil life, resided at Kuṇavāyil near Karūr (Vanji), the ancient capital of the Cēra; and the second, the companion and supplement, though the earlier composed, from the pen of (rather the style of) *Madurai Kūlavāṇigan Śāttan* otherwise known as Śīttalaichchāttanār, the corn merchant of Madura (His head was believed to have been exuding matter on account of the blows dealt by himself whenever he detected errors in other's composition, considering it a misfortune to have to read or listen to such blunders; so uncompromising was he as a critic). Before proceeding to a consideration of these great works, it is better to dispose of a few other important characters.

Of the last seven patrons celebrated in the *Śiṛu-pāṇāṟṟuppaḍai* of Nallūr Nattattanār (believed to be one of the Śaṅgam forty-nine), there is one *Pēhan* (otherwise *Vaiyāvikkōn Perumbēhan*) who was so liberal (inconsiderately so) as to give a warm covering to a peacock. This same incident is referred to in poem 145 of the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* ascribed to Paraṇar. This personage some time in his life transferred his affection from his wife Kaṇṇaki (to be carefully distinguished from the heroine of the 'epic') and several poets, among whom Paraṇar, made poetical appeals on her behalf. The others were Kapilar, Ariśil Kiḻār and Perumkuṉṟūr Kiḻār (poems 43—47 both inclusive of the *Puṟanāṉūṟu*). There is considerable similarity of sentiment in these. Poem 343 of the same work is also ascribed to Paraṇar and it refers to a Kuṭṭuvan very liberal in the

donation of wealth 'brought down hill-country and from oversea.'

Passing on to *Kapilar*, another Śaṅgam celebrity reputed by tradition* to be the younger brother of Tiruvaḻḻuvar, it is found that he had for his patron and friend a chieftain, *Vēḷ Pāri*, whose demesne Paṟambunāḍu comprised 300 villages and who was master of Paṟambu Hill. Kapilar is credited with having composed the *kuṟinji* section of the *Aiguṟunūṟu*, the seventh of the 'Ten Tens,' the *kuṟinjippāṭṭu* of the 'Ten Idylls' (all Śaṅgam works) and the *Iṅnā* (that which is bad and therefore to be avoided) forty. When Pāri fell a victim to the treachery of the 'three powers,' who made a futile attack on him jointly, Kapilar as his chief friend took his two girls with him to be given away in marriage to some person worthy of them and thus do his last duty to his departed friend. Poems 200, 201 and 202 of the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* refer to the incident† of Pāri's giving a car to the creeper *mullai* and to Kapilar's offering the girls to Vichchikkōn and Pulikaḍimāl‡ Iruṅgōvēl of Malaināḍu. Both of them refused to marry the girls, and some insult offered as to the social standing of his patron's family the poet resents in poem 202. Poem 201 refers to Iruṅgōvēḷ having been descended in the forty-ninth generation from the ruler of 'Tuvarai'§ who was born from

* The actual story connecting these is regarded as a fabrication by some scholars.

† *Vide Śiṟupāṉ.*

‡ He that killed a tiger.

§ Tuvarai may be either Dvāraka in Guzerat or Dvāravati or Dvārasamudra of the Hoysālas.

Govt. Kilpauk Medical College, Madras-10.

a sacrificial fire. The title Pulikaḍimāl has considerable similarity in its origin to a story which is given as explaining the origin of the Hoyśālas in inscriptions of a later time. The following poem resents Iruṅgōvēḷ's refusal to marry the girls and refers to the destruction of Aṛayam city, the headquarters of this family, in consequence of an insult offered to the poet Kaḻāttalaiyār* by an ancestor of Iruṅgōvēl's. The poet further begs, with biting sarcasm, to be pardoned for his having introduced the girls as the daughters of Pāri, instead of as the descendants of Evvi (a chief in the Pāṇdya country).

Kapilar himself is connected with the *Cēra Mantharam Śēral Iṛumpoṛai* and spoken of with great regard as a poet by another poet *Porundhil Iḷaṅgīranār*. Poem 126 by *Marōkkattu Nappaśalaiyār* refers to his having praised *Malaiyamān Tirumuḍikkāri* who was in possession of Muḷḷūr Hill. It incidentally refers to the naval strength of the Śēra, likening the futility of the author's attempt at celebrating Kāri when Kapilar had done so, to the endeavour to sail a ship in the face of the Cēra fleet. Poem 174 by the same author refers incidentally to Muḷḷūr Hill, celebrated by Kapilar, and directly to Śoḻiyavēnādi Tirukkaṇṇan (otherwise Tirukkiḷḷi), who rendered yeoman's service to Peruvīrarkkiḷḷi while in hiding at Muḷḷūr. The poem further credits the Malayamān Śoḻiyavēnādi Tirukkaṇṇan with having restored the Chōḷa to his position.

Another person that Kapilar celebrates is *Tirumuḍikkāri ruler of Malainādu*, with his capital at Tirukkōvilūr

* Another poet who celebrates Karikāla, and his Cēra contemporary, Peruṁśeralādhan. (Poem 65, *Puṛanānūṛu*).

and with the hill Muḷḷūr. Poems 122 and 123 refer to his having been sought in alliance by the three powers.

Beginning with a consideration of what little is known of these three personages, Avvaiyār, Paraṇar and Kapilar, we have been introduced to a number of poets and potentates living within a generation of one another. Before proceeding to a consideration of the chief rulers of the age and their geographical location, let us turn aside to glean what we can of contemporary history from the two epics of the age of Śeṅguṭṭuvan, who was, by far, the most important character of the period and about whom we could gather an amount of information from the above works.

The '*Epic of the Anklet*' is the story of Kōvalan (Gōpāla, and his wife Kaṇṇaki, both of the mercantile community of Puhār (Kāverippūmpaṭṭinam), and has, for its moral the triumph of the wife's chastity and the vindication of the husband's innocence. The story is as follows in brief outline :—Kōvalan, the son of Māśāttuvan of Puhār was early married to Kaṇṇaki, the beautiful daughter of Mānāygan of the same place and community; and the marriage was celebrated with great pomp and becoming circumstance, as the two parties were of high social standing. After a while the mother-in-law set her daughter-in-law up independently in a different house in the same city, provided with all that the young couple might need for conducting a successful and virtuous life, as householder and housewife. Some time after, Kōvalan took a fancy for a highly accomplished and exceedingly lovable professional dancing-woman, whose skill in her art was unsurpassed — nay, even unsurpassable. The lover and mistress led a

happy life and had a daughter, the only offspring of their affection. Disconsolate as Kaṇṇaki was, she never lost her affection for the husband who had thus given her up, and was quite as faithful to him as she would have been under ordinary circumstances. At the conclusion of the annual festival to the god Indra, the usual bathing in the sea brought the festivities to a close. This was a day of enjoyment for all and the whole elegant society of Puhār turned out to the beach to spend the day in music, dancing, and other such amusements. The happy lovers singing to the accompaniment of the '*yāḻ*' (a Tamil musical instrument now gone out of use) by turns, suspected each the other of having changed his or her affection, from the tenor of the songs. Stung by this imagined bad faith on the part of his sweetheart, Mādhavi, Kōvalan went home to his house, instead of to hers as usual, and felt quite ashamed of himself for his treatment of the wife, who redoubled her attentions to him since she had seen that something ailed her lord. Overcome with remorse, Kōvalan confessed to his wife his position with respect to Mādhavi and communicated to her his resolution to make amends for his past misconduct by entering on business in Madura on his own account, asking her if she would follow him, should he act upon his resolution. Kaṇṇaki signified a ready assent and gave her husband the pair of anklets (*śilambu*), the only hing valuable he had not as yet given away to Mādhavi, for providing the requisite capital to the prospective merchant of Madura. That very night the repentant and admiring husband with his faithful spouse started away before dawn unknown to anyone, and took his way along the northern bank of the Kāvēri. Picking up the

nun Dēvandī, a few miles above Puhār, they continued their journey to Śrīrangam and Uraiyūr. Thence taking one of the three roads indicated by the Malaināḍu Brahman from Māngāḍu (Alawayi in Travancore) who was returning from Madura on a pilgrimage to the shrines of Vishṇu, they reached the outskirt of the capital city of the Pāṇḍyans. Leaving his tender wife in charge of a hospitable shepherdess and her daughter, he entered Madura city the next day to sell one of the pair of anklets. Not finding a ready sale, as the jewel was of very high value, he wandered long before he was accosted by a goldsmith, who was going palaceward at the head of a number of his apprentices. On Kōvalan's offering the jewel for sale, the wily smith promised to get it sold, with a request that he would keep the jewel with him and wait there till he should send for him from the palace whither he was then going. Proceeding gleefully to the royal residence, he reported to the king that the thief who had stolen the queen's anklet had been caught with the jewel in his possession and had been kept waiting under promise of purchase. The king who was much distressed at the loss of the jewel and the pain it caused the queen, asked that the jewel be brought, 'killing the thief'; he actually meant, asking the man and the jewel to be brought, to kill the man, if guilty. The plot of the goldsmith, the real culprit, succeeded so well that the king was deluded and the innocent hero was murdered, after transacting a pathetic scene much like one in Shakespeare's Richard III. News of this clamity reached Kaṇṇaki who, in great anger, forgot her usual modesty, and bent upon establishing her husband's innocence and the power of her chastity, walked boldly

forth quite, unlike her ordinary self, with the other anklet in her hand and rang the bell of justice in the great gate of the palace. This alarm, quite unheard of in the reign of the then Pāṇḍyan ruler, aroused the suspicions of the hall-porter that something seriously wrong had taken place. The unusual apparition of a young injured woman with an anklet in one of her hands, anger and grief on the countenance, was immediately announced to the king. Admitted without delay into the royal presence, Kaṇṇaki proved that the anklet for which her husband suffered death was hers and not the queen's, demonstrating that the jewel in dispute was filled with rubies. The queen affirmed hers was filled with pearls. Kaṇṇaki invoked a curse that Madura be consumed by fire for this remissness of her king, who, rather than survive this disgrace he brought upon a line of illustrious rulers, died immediately. The queen followed her consort, and Kaṇṇaki left the city by the western gate towards the hill-country, where she was to join her husband in a fortnight, as promised by the goddess of Madura.

This union of the wife and the husband was seen by the hill-tribes, who duly reported the matter to their king, then in camp on the hills with his queen and retinue. At the request of the good queen, the king built a temple and consecrated it to the chaste lady (Pattinī Dēvī) who had undergone so recent an apotheosis.

This is, in the merest outline, the story of the first epic, and the second is a sequel to this. Information of all the proceedings at Madura was given at Puhār by a Brahman friend of Kōvalan, who, having bathed at Kumāri (Cape Comorin, near which was once a river), was baiting at

Madura on his homeward journey. The mother and mother-in-law of Kaṇṇaki died of grief. The father and father-in-law renounced life and became Buddhistic monks.

Mādhavi, disconsolate at Kōvalan's sudden disappearance, sent him an importunate appeal to return, while he was yet on his outward journey to Madura. Finding it of no avail, she had been overcome with grief, and when news of Kōvalan's death reached her, she gave up life and all its pleasures to become a lay disciple of a Buddhistic monk; while her daughter just blooming into a woman of rare beauty and womanly grace entered the Buddhistic cloister. "*Jewel-Belt*" (Maṇimēkhalai) was her name and her renunciation forms the subject of the epic with her name. The heir-apparent of Puhār is very deeply in love with her, but she is taken care of by a goddess, who plays the guardian angel, much like the Ariel of Shakespeare. To save her from the loving prince's ardour, she is removed to an island by the goddess while asleep; and there she is initiated into the Buddhist mysteries. Having understood her past life, she returns to Puhār with a begging-bowl of extraordinary virtue. The prince still prosecuting his hopeless love, falls a victim to the jealousy of an angel, whose wife's disguise the heroine assumed to keep out her importunate lover, her own husband in a previous life. Consoling the queen and the king in their sorrow for the loss of their son, she leaves Puhār (at the mouth of the Kāvēri) and proceeds to Vanji (not far from Kranganūr at the mouth of the Periyār), where she learns all that the teachers of different religious systems have to teach her Not satisfied with their philosophy of religion, she is directed to Kānchi by her grandfather, who had betaken himself

to Vanji in anticipation of Puhār being overwhelmed by the sea. Maṇimēkhala proceeds to Kānchi and relieves the place from famine by the use of her begging-bowl. Learning the true philosophy of the Buddha from a saintly monk, she stopped there. This is the merest outline of the two poems, forming a single epic, which are of a dramatic-epic character with something of the narrative in it. Containing, as they do, a great deal of the supernatural, there is yet much that must be regarded as historical. In one word, the setting is poetical, but the back-ground is historical.

The 'Epic of the Anklet' has much to say about the "three great kings of the south" and its companion concerns itself with three likewise; but the place of the Pāṇḍyan is taken by the ruler of Kānchi. To begin with the Cōḻa kings celebrated by the poets, two names stand out; those of *Karikāla* and *Kiḷḷi*, called indifferently Neḍumuḍikkiḷḷi, Velvērkiḷḷi, Mavaṇkiḷḷi, etc. Of these two, Dr. Hultzsch has the following in his South Indian Inscripsons*:—"It will be observed that each of the four documents, which record the names and achievements of these ancient Cōḻa kings, enumerates them in a different order. One of the four kings, Kōkkiḷḷi can hardly be considered a historical person, as he is credited with having entered a subterraneous cave and there to have contracted a marriage with a serpent princess, and as the *Vikkirama Śōḻan Ulā*, places him before the two mythical kings, Śibi and Kavera." . . . . Of Karikāla and Kō-chchengaṇ here follows what the same authority has to say: "A comparison of these conflicting statements shews that at the

* Vol. II, Part III, pp. 377—78.

time of the composition of the three documents referred to, no tradition remained regarding the order in which Kōchchengaṇ and Karikāla succeeded each other. Probably their names were only known from ancient Tamil panegyrics of the same type as *Kaḷavaḻi* and *Paṭṭinappālai* It would be a mistake to treat them as actual ancestors of that Chōḷa dynasty, whose epigraphical records have come down to us. They must rather be considered as representatives of extinct dynasties of the Chōḷa country, whose names had survived in Tamil literature either by chance or by specially marked achievements.

"To Karikāla the Leyden grant attributes the building of embankments along the Kāvēri river. The same act is alluded to in the *Kalingattupparaṇi* and *Vikkirama Śōḻan Ulā*. The *Kalingattupparaṇi* adds that he paid 1,600,000 gold pieces to the author of the *Paṭṭinappālai*. According to *Porunarāṟṟuppaḍai* of Muḍathāma Kaṇṇiyār the name of the king's father was Iḷanjētchenni. The king himself is there called Karigāl or black-leg or the elephant-leg ; while the Sanskritized form of his name Karikāla would mean 'death to elephants.' He is said to have defeated the Cēra and Pāṇḍya kings in battle fought at Veṇṇil. According to the *Silappadhikāram* his capital was Kāverippūmpaṭṭinam. In one of his interesting contributions to the history of ancient Tamil literature, the Hon'ble P. Coomarasami allots Karikāla to the 1st century A.D. This opinion is based on the fact that the commentaries on the *Silappadhikāram* represent Karikāla as the maternal grandfather of the Cēra king, Seṅguṭṭuvan, a contemporary of Gajabāhu of Ceylon. Mr. Coomarasami identifies the latter with

Gajabāhu I, who, according to the *Mahāvamsa*, reigned from (135 A.D.). With due respect to Mr. Coomarasami's sagacity, I am not prepared to accept this view, unless the identity of the two Gajabāhus is not only supported by the mere identity of name but proved by internal reasons, and until the chronology of the early history of Ceylon has been subjected to a critical examination."

A careful examination of the first book of the 'Epic of the Anklet' shows that during the early part of the life of the hero, *the king of Puhār was Karikāla Chōḻa.* Apart from the fact that the commentator invariably interprets all references to the ruling king as applying to Karikāla (and this in itself is much, as the commentator was one who was thoroughly qualified for the task and can, as such, be expected to embody nothing but correct tradition in his commentaries), there are a number of direct references to him—either by name or by the attribute of his having erected the tiger-emblem on the Himālayas. The last four lines of canto i-blesses the ruler "who erected the tiger-emblem on the crest of the Himālayas." There is direct mention of Karikāla's name and his rewarding the poet of the *Pālai* [*Pattinappālai*]* in one of the manuscripts consulted by the editor; further down, lines 158–160 of canto vi. mention as clearly as one could wish Karikāla as ruling at the time, and the commentator explains it as such by giving the passage the necessary expansion, not to mention the allusive but undoubted reference to the same

* Pages 44 and 45—Pandit Svaminatha Iyer's edition of *Śilappadhikāram*. There is nothing in the lines to lead one to regard them as later interpolations.

personage in lines 95-98 of canto v. Of the three kings praised in canto xvii, there is reference to Karikāla's Himālayan exploit in the last stanza in page 400, and this is the last Chōḻa ruler referred to. Canto xxi, lines 11 *et seq.*, clearly state that Karikāla's daughter had married the then Cēra king, whom she joined when he lost* his life in the sea. These would undoubtedly point to Karikāla as having ruled at Kāverippūmpaṭṭinam till Kōvalan's departure for Madura. The supernatural achievements are clearly nothing more than the fanciful way in which these Buddhistic authors attempt to explain even the most ordinary occurrences. The most cursory examination will discover that it is so, and the faith of these authors in the doctrine of *karma* comes in for much that would otherwise be inexplicable in the story.

To return to *Karikāla.* He was *the son of Uruvappaharēr-Iḷanjētchenni* and had married among the Nāngūr Vēḷ class. He is reputed to have assumed the form of an old judge in order to satisfy the scruples of the parties, who were afraid that, being a youth, he could not bring mature experience to bear upon the question coming up for decision. His name is actually accounted for as having been due to an accident by fire † while yet a baby. He is the hero of the two poems in the "Ten Tamil Idylls," *Porunarāṟṟuppaḍai* of Muḍattāmakkaṇṇiyār and the *Paṭṭinappālai* of Rudirāngaṇṇanār, for which latter the

* The text has it that when he was drowned she called out for him. The waves shewed him to her when she joined him and both disappeared, much like Kaṇṇaki's union with her husband.

† The 3rd stanza from the *Paḻamoḻi* quoted at the end of the *Porunarāṟṟuppaḍai.*

author received the 16 lakhs of gold pieces mentioned above. He defeated the Cēra by name Perumśēralādhan and a Pāṇḍyan whose name is not mentioned in the battle of Veṇṇil.* This Cēra wounded in the back in battle retired to the north in disgrace.† Rudirānganṇanār celebrates another hero, the *Toṇḍamān Iḷandirayan of Kānchi* whom tradition traces to the Chōḷa Kiḷḷi by a "Nāga" princess, as stated by Dr. Hultzsch, in the quotation above.

This Kiḷḷi otherwise Neḍumuḍi Kiḷḷi, is the ill-fated *successor of Karikāla*, in whose reign a catastrophe befell Puhār and brought the Chōḷa fortunes very low indeed. While luckily there are but a few Karikālas among South Indian rulers, there are a number of Kiḷḷis,‡ among whom it is a matter of great difficulty indeed to fasten upon the individual here mentioned. Fortunately for us there are certain distinguishing features which give us the clue. One of the exploits of Śeṅguṭṭuvan Śēra is the victory at Nērivāyil, a village near Uraiyūr (Trichinopoly), where he defeated the nine Kiḷḷis of the Chōḷa family and thus restored his cousin (brother-in-law) to power. From the 'Epic of the Anklet' and the 'Jewel-Belt,' we learn he was the last ruler in Puhār and it was in his reign that the ancient Chōḷa capital was overwhelmed by the sea. It is this Kiḷḷi whatever his distinguishing epithet, that is the *father of the Toṇḍamān* referred to by Dr. Hultzsch. While in the

* Lines 143–148. *Porunarāṟṟuppaḍai* Veṇṇil is Kōvil Veṇṇi in the Tanjore District.

† *Puṟanāṉūṟu* poems 65 and 66.

‡ Twelve in *Puṟanāṉūṟu'* and nine in *Śilappadhikāram*.

Perumbāṇāṟṟuppaḍai, the commentator Nachchinārkkiniyār (who must have lived in the 13th centuary A. D. or thereabouts)* makes the Toṇḍamān the son of a Nāga princess with whom the Chōḻa lived in a cave, which is generally taken to mean the nether-world, the 'Jewel Belt' gives the following much less romantic version of the story, which agrees in all details except the cave, so far as it goes while accounting for the destruction of Puhār. Without going so far out as the Hades, we find reference to Nāga rulers in India and Ceylon, between whom a war once took place for the possession of some Buddha-relic, according to the 'Jewel Belt.'† The same also refers to another race of the Nāgas as "naked cannibals." The story goes on to state that Kiḷḷi fell in love with a Nāga princess, who appeared before him all alone like a damsel from the fairy-land, in what is called the "Kaḻi Kānal"‡ (the grove by the back-water) at Puhār. After a month of happy life, she left him (and this is explained away by preordination), when she had taken her residence in an island near the coast§ 300 miles away from the Puhār. Some time after she became the mother of a beautiful son, she sent the child to the father through a merchant, whose

* Mr. Anavarada Vinayagam Pillai allots him to the 9th century A. D. (*Christian Coll. Mag.*, XVII), 1900.

† We find reference to such wars in *Mahāvamśa*, in the earlier chapters of the work.

‡ This Kaḻi Kānal is referred to in canto vii as the place of resort of pleasure-seekers—nay, a veritable "lover's arbour" in Puhār.

§ *Vide Maṇimēkhalai* note, pp. 97 and 98. The island of Ceylon, in which is Adam's Peak, is sacred to the Buddhists. This hill is now known as Samantakūṭam and Samanelāi, but referred to in the work as Samantam and Samanoḷi.

ship called at the island on its homeward journey. While nearing Puhār, the ship got wrecked off the coast and the baby's fate was not known for certain. On hearing of this disaster, the king ordered a thorough search to be made, and in his paternal anxiety forgot his duty to the god Indra, whose annual festival had been forgotten. The wrath of the god shewed itself, very likely, in a storm-wave which destroyed Puhār completely.*

This account taken from the 'Jewel Belt' of the birth of the Toṇḍamān makes Dr. Hultzsch's objection as to the myth, lose edge, and therefore it is quite possible—nay even historical—that there was a human ruler by name Kiḻḻi, who ruled at Puhār after Karikāla.

[*Note.*—The descent into the Hades, therefore, will have to be regarded as an eastern figure of speech and nothing more. There are other incidents throughout these epics, which interpreted literally would be quite as absurd ; and these are easily accounted for by the author's belief in the doctrine of Karma and rebirth, the main pillar of the Buddhistic faith, as also to a modified extent of the Brahmanic. It is this that makes them attempt to account for actual phenomena by causes supernatural. This feature modern European critics fail to bear in mind, and hence all appears grotesquely legendary and absurdly fabulous. These remarks find their full application in the 'Jewel-Belt', though there is hardly any Indian work of

* There is a story of similar import with respect to a Ceylonese king, whose wife was abducted by a Chōḻa king under similar circumstances. There are no grounds to connect the two at present, at any rate.

a quasi-religious or ethical character in criticising which one could afford to forget them.]

The destruction of Puhār referred to above accounts for the association of Kiḷḷi with Uraiyūr at the end of the 'Epic of the Anklet,' in the course of which the catastrophe to Puhār must have happened. The ruler at Kānchi during the period, according to the 'Jewel-Belt,' was an *Iḷam Kiḷḷi, the brother of Kaḻar Kiḷḷi.*

This last ruler of Puhār is referred to in the 'Jewel-Belt' with the following adjuncts indifferently, *viz.*, Vaḍivērkkiḷḷi, Velvērkkiḷḷi, Māvaṅkiḷḷi and Neḍumuḍikkiḷḷi. With the help of his younger brother, *Iḷangō* (perhaps Iḷamkiḷḷi of Kānchi), who was probably the heir-apparent as the term would indicate, he defeated the Cēras and Pāṇḍyas on the banks of the river Kāri.* The three poems concerning this personage in the *Puṟanānūṟu* refer to his having been besieged at Uraiyūr and Āmūr by Nalamkiḷḷi. After the destruction of Puhār he must have been reduced to the woeful plight from which Śeṅguṭṭuvan Śēra must have relieved him by his victory at Nērivāyil † over the nine Chōḻa princes who forgot their allegiance to the Kiḷḷi. This is borne out by the enmity between Neḍumuḍikkiḷḷi and Naḷamkiḷḷi indicated in poems 44, 45 and 47 of *Puṟanānūṟu.* There are besides a number more of Kiḷḷis, each

* Pandit Svaminatha Iyer's edition of *Maṇimēkhala*, page 174, xix, lines 124-130.

† Nērivāyil in later history belonged to the Kshatriya Sikhāmaṇi Vaḷanāḍu, *i. e.*, the region round Uraiyūr, and the royal secretary of Vīrarājēndra was the owner of this village as also of Tāḻi Tirappanangāḍu. *South Indian Inscriptions*, Vol. III.

with a distinguishing epithet which would support the existence of the nine Kiḷḷis (Kiḷḷi being a generic name of the Chōḻas like Śenni, etc.) The author of these poems *Kōvil Kiḻār*, celebrates another Kiḷḷi who died at Kuḷa-muṟṟam. None of these Kiḷḷis is associated with Puhār. In fact neither in the *Puṟanānūṟu* nor in the *Śiṟupāṇ-āṟṟuppaḍai* do we find the city of Puhār associated with these Chōḻas.

Leaving aside the Chōḻas, we find the whole time, during which the incidents narrated in the two epics, took place, taken up by *Śeṅguṭṭuvan Śēra*, whose capital was at Vañji (Karūr) at the mouth of the Periyār on the west coast. His exploits are recorded in some detail in these works and the others referred to already. His father and uncle are celebrated in the two preceding sections of the "Ten Tens." His chief achievements were a naval victory over the 'Kaḍambu', two invasions of the north with victories on the banks of the Ganges over Kanaka and Vijaya, sons of Bālakumāra, and the victories at Nērivāyil and Viyalūr (there is a Viyalūr connected with Nannan, an ancestor of Vichchikkōn, whom Kapilar celebrates in poem 200 of the *Puṟanānūṟu*). Like his father, Śeṅguṭṭu-van also claims to have cut out the bow-emblem on the Himālayas.

Coming to the Pāṇḍyas of Madura, we have two names in the 'Epic of the Anklet,' *viz.*, *Neḍum Cheḻiyan*, victor over the "Aryan army," and *Iḷam Cheḻiyan*, who was viceroy at Korkai when Nuḍum Cheḻiyan died at Madura. Before discussing these names we have to dispose of one other Pāṇḍyan of importance in literary history. When

Tiruvaḷḷuvar submitted the *Kuṟaḷ* to the Śaṅgam critics, the king was *Ugra-Pāṇḍyan*, victor over the "big forest fort (Kānappēreyil) under the chief Vēngaimārban.'' The *Tiruviḷaiyāḍal Purāṇam* ascribes to him some achievements which are of a legendary character, though some might have been possible. These are the very achievements * ascribed to a Pāṇḍya ruler by the Malaināḍu (hill-country) Brahman from Māngāḍu, (*Alangādu or Alavāyi*) then at Uraiyūr in the course of a pilgrimage to the shrines of Vishṇu, who directed Kōvalan to Madura from Uraiyūr. This praise would lose all point unless it referred to the ruling Pāṇḍyan when the Brahman pilgrim sojourned at Madura, on his visit to Tirumāliruñjōlai. The author of the epic clearly designates him the Pāṇḍyan Neḍum Cheḻiyan "victor over the Aryan forces," whatever these forces might have been. There are a number of references throughout the work to the erecting of the fish-emblem on the Himālayas. It is the boast of Karikāla Chōḻa and Ugra-Pāṇḍyan, Neḍumśēralādhan (father of Śeṅguṭṭuvan), that they cut out their respective emblems on the Himālayas. These achievements are clearly ascribed to the reigning Pāṇḍyan in the commencing and the concluding lines of canto xvii. Thus then the Ugra-Pāṇḍyan† of the

* Canto xi, lines 23-31. There are besides references to his achievements in connection with the ruling Pāṇḍyan in many places throughout the work.

† Stanza 4, bottom of page 400. Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai in his interesting papers on "The Tamils 1800 Years Ago," makes Ugra-Pāṇḍyan the contemporary of the successor of the Kiḷḷi, the grandson of Karikāla. This would bring Tiruvaḷḷuvar's *Kuṟal* too late for quotation by the friendly authors of the two epics, ss the *Kuṟal* received the Śaṅgam approval under Ugra-Pāṇḍyan. (*Madras Review* Vol. II, No. 6.)

purāṇas and tradition could not have been any other than the ill-starred Pāṇḍyan Neḍum Cheḻiyan of the 'Epic of the Anklet.' Avvaiyār's reference to Paraṇar referred to above would agree quite well with this identification, as in accordance with that reference, Paraṇar should have been the earlier of the two.

The successor of the Pāṇḍyan, apparently his son, *Pāṇḍyan Iḷam Cheḻiyan*, otherwise Veṟṟivēr-Cheḻiyan, was in Korkai when his father died and succeeded to his father's estate in the course of the story. We are vouchsafed no other information, except that he propitiated the manes of the injured lady, Kaṇṇaki, by the sacrifice of 100 goldsmiths (perhaps a massacre of that class of artisans). Probably his reign was short and uneventful. He must have been succeeded by Pāṇḍyan Neḍum Cheḻiyan, victor at Talaiyālangānam * over the two other kings and seven chiefs. Kapilar is connected with prince *Mānlharam Śēralirumporai* of the "elephant-look" by *Porundhil Iḷam Kīranār* in poem 53 of *Puṟanānūṟu*. This Cēra was ruling over Toṇḍi (Quilandy, and not the Śōḻan Toṇḍi, on the east coast now in the Rāmnād *zamīndāri*), and was the master of Kolli Malai † (a hill in the Salem District quite on the border of Trichinopoly). His position in this region would have been possible only in the light of Śeṅguṭṭuvan's victories over the Kongus at Seṅgaḷam (red-field), at Viyalūr, about the same region, and over the nine

* He must have been particularly young when he came to the throne, *Puṟam*, 7.

† The last lines of canto, xiv, the 'Epic of the Anklet,' refer to the reigning Cēra as the ruler over the country between the Himālayas with the bow-emblem and Kolli Malai.

Chōḻas at Nērivāyil (near Trichinopoly). This personage was taken prisoner by the Pāṇḍyan Neḍum Cheḻiyan * of Talaiyālangānam fame. At this latter place, the young Pāṇḍyan overthrew the "Tamil army" under the two kings and 'seven chiefs.' This Pāṇḍyan was a great celebrity in literature and in his reign flourished a number of poets of the Śangam fame. He is the hero of Māngudi Marudanār's *Maduraikkānji* and Nakkīrar's *Neḍunalvāḍai* among the "Ten Tamil Idylls." He was himself, like several other rulers of those days, including his grandfather, a poet. There are a number of poems relating to him in the *Puṛanānūṛu* collection. Thus we see that during the course of the story, the *rulers of Puhār* were Karikāla and his grandson, Kōkkiḷḷi; † of Madura, Neḍum Cheḻiyan identified with Ugra-Pāṇḍyan and Iḷam Cheḻiyan followed later by Neḍum Cheḻiyan, victor over the Tamil army at Talaiyālangānam; the Cēra ruler all the time at Karūr [Vañji] was Śenguṭṭuvan Śēra, the brother of the author of the epic and the patron of the author of the 'Jewel-Belt,' the father and the uncle of this personage having been the heroes of 2nd and 3rd sections of the "Ten Tens". Chēy (prince) of the "elephant-look", must have been his son and viceroy of the newly-conquered territories.

These were the sovereigns of the three kingdoms who flourished in the generation of the literary celebrities

---

* *S. A.*, canto xxviii, lines 115-125. Seḻiyan is again a generic name like Pāṇḍyan, and the father or the son have the adjunct "big" "young" much as 'Smith, senior or junior.'

† Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai places a Nalamkiḷḷi between these two. (*Madras Review*, Vol. II, No. 7.)

headed by the names chosen at the commencement, *viz.*, *Avvaiyār, Paraṇar and Kapilar.* These were the three stars of the first magnitude in the literary firmament, as those in the political, of South India. Other poets there were and patrons likewise. Of the latter, mention has already been made of Pāri, of Paṟambānāḍu and Paṟambu Hill; Kāri of Tirukkōvilūr in Malaināḍu and Muḷḷūr Hill; Iruṇgōvēḷ of Araiyam in the Western hill-country of the "Tuvarai * family with the special distinction of having killed a tiger to save a saint absorbed in contemplation"; Pēhan of Nallūr in Malaināḍu (hill-country); and Adiyamān Anji of Tagaḍūr and the Horse-hill, overthrown according to the 8th section of the "Ten Tens" by the Perum Śēral who overthrew Tagaḍūr. These are all mentioned by name as well as by distinguishing achievements, most of them in a somewhat fabulous garb in the *Sirupāṇāṟṟuppaḍai* of Nallūr Nattattanār. Besides these, we have already mentioned the prince Cēra of the "elephant look," ruler of Toṇḍi and master of Kolli Hill. To come to the poets, in addition, to the three already referred to, we must mention here only a few of the more important, such as *Tiruvaḷḷuvar, Iḷangōvaḍigal, Śittalai Śāttanār, Rudirānganṇanār, Muḍattāmakkaṇṇiyār, Mānguḍi Marudanār, Nakkīrar* and others, whose works are held even to-day in high esteem by the Tamil world as masterpieces in their respective departments. Some of the rulers were themselves poets of some merit.

* Tuvarai might have been either Dvāraka in Guzerat or Dvāravati or Halebid in Mysore; but the latter does not appear till much later, and the name Iuvarai in classical works is always taken to mean Dvāraka.

and Avvaiyār was not the only poetess. The two young daughters of Pāri could compose verses and the elegiacs ascribed to them is proof of their ability in this direction. There is besides a poem in *Puṟanāṉūṟu* ascribed to the wife of Bhūta Pāṇḍyan, who performed *sati* on the funeral pyre of her husband. These names raise a strong presumption in favour of the view that, as the age of Śeṅguṭṭuvan (including in it a generation either way) was one of great literary activity, it might have been the time when the Śaṅgam activity was at its height. * This was the age when the creed of the Buddha was in the ascendant, which, like all other reform movements of a later time, gave a powerful impetus to the development of the vernaculars of the country. Although the Śaṅgam is not mentioned as such in these early works, we find the *cultivation of Tamil specially associated with Madura*, which is often referred to as "Tamil Kūḍal," † despite the fact that a large number of poets mentioned above flourished in other courts. In the traditional lists of Śaṅgam celebrities we find mention of the names of most of the authors referred to above. It is not improbable, therefore, that *a Board of censors like the Śaṅgam* existed about this age at Madura.

---

* It will be clear from the above that the author of the *Kuṟaḷ* could not have been much earlier than the friendly authors of the epics. Still they quote with great respect from the *Kuṟaḷ*. This could only be if the *Kuṟaḷ* were authoritatively approved of after being read out before the Śaṅgam, Śīttalai Śāttan being one of the august body. Iḷaṅgō, however, was not among this body, although he quotes from the *Kuṟaḷ* likewise.

† *Śiṟupāṇ* and *Puṟanāṉūṟu* and *Kalingattupparaṇi*, of a later age.

Without pausing to examine what other literary men could be grouped along with those spoken of already, we might pass on to the consideration of the more important question of the *probable age of this great literary activity in South India.* The two chief epics—the 'Epic of the Anklet' and the 'Jewel Belt,'—were Buddhistic, the latter more so than the former; and the other works of the age show considerable Buddhistic influence and follow in this order with regard to dates of composition. The *Kuṛaḷ* is the earliest of the major works, as there are quotations from this work in the companion epics, which even acknowledge the quotations. The two epics must have been composed about the same period—the 'Jewel Belt' preceding the other—the *Ahanānūṛu* miscellany is ascribed to Ugra Pāṇḍyan, before whom the *Kuṛaḷ* received the Śaṅgam imprimatur. The *Kuṇḍalakēśi* is another Buddhistic work and, so far as we know it at present, of a controversial character, much like the 'Jewel-Belt' in plan of work. This was followed by the *Nilakēśittirāṭṭu* which attempts a refutation of the *Kuṇḍalakēśi* and must, therefore, be of a later age. If this general course of literary activity is correctly indicated by the editor of 'Śeṅ Tamil,' whose account seems to be in keeping with the substance of the texts, and if we can fix the probable period of *this literary activity*, this will prove *the sheet anchor in the literary chronology of South India.*

In the midst of the confused tangle of mere names and names of similar sound and meaning, we have, luckily just a few distinct characters and characteristics that make the attempt not altogether hopeless, provided the question be

approached in the spirit of unbiassed enquiry. Although *Kiḷḷi* is quite a common name among the Chōḷa rulers, *Karikāla* is somewhat uncommon. Śeṅguṭṭuvan is definite enough and his Ceylon contemporary Gajabāhu's name occurs, luckily for students of Tamil history, but twice among 174 names unlike Vikrambhāhu, for instance. The *Kalingattupparaṇi*, a work composed between (1111—1135 A. D.) refers to Karikāla and Kōkkiḷḷi in the reverse order, Kiḷḷi being followed by Kōchcheṅgaṅ, Karikāla following both. There appears, from the *Puṟanāṉūṟu*, to have been a Kiḷḷi in the third generation before Karikāla ; but the Chōḷa succession is fixed as follows with respect to this, taking only such names as are specifically mentioned in the order given below :—Iḷanjētchenni, his son Karikāla, his grandson Neḍumuḍikkiḷḷi. The *Kalingattupparaṇi*, like the great commentator who must have lived after Jayam Koṇḍān, the author of this work, ascribes to Kiḷḷi the descent into the Hades. It is just possible that there was a mistake made, as to the particular Kiḷḷi whose union with the Nāga princess was thus described by later writers. If this were so, the Karikāla of the Himālayan fame could not have been Kullōttunga I. (1070 A. D.—1118 A. D.) certainly, nor the viceroy of Koḷi (Uraiyūr) in the reign of his father-in-law Rājēndra (1053–1060 A.D.). There is one other Karikāla of the later dynasty* whose epigraphical records are available to us—Āditya Karikāla (*circa* 950—985 A. D.) who killed Vīra Pāṇḍyan in battle,

* For a list of this dynasty of kings, see the table prefixed to author's article, "The Chōḷa Ascendency in South India" (*Madras Review*) for November 1902, or the *South Indian Inscription*, Vol. III, Part II, recently published.

as if in sport. But the author of the *Kalingattupparaṇi* places Karikāla three names before Vīra-Nārāyaṇa or Parāntaka I, while Āditya was the eldest son of Parāntaka, a grandson of the first of that name. So then we are driven to the necessity of looking for *this Karikāla far earlier than A. D. 900.*

It was shewn above that the works themselves point to an age when the religion of the Buddha was in the ascendant as the probable period when the works under consideration—at least the greatest of them—were composed. Buddhism was overthrown by about the 7th century A. D. when Hiuen Tsang was travelling through India, and when Tirugñānasambanda flourished. About A. D. 862, a battle was fought between Varaguṇa Pāṇḍyan* and the western Ganga king Sivamara, at Sri Parambi (Tirupparambiyam near Kumbakonam). This would not have been possible had the Chōḻas been at all powerful. Nor do the works of the age under review mention the Gangas as so powerful. We are at this period (A. D. 750–850) passing out of the Pallava ascendency in south India which must have begun about A. D. 500, if not earlier, with Vishṇugōpa of Kānchi, the contemporary of Samudragupta. There is no reference in the works under notice to such premier position of the Pallavas or even the Toṇḍamān *rājās*—the only Toṇḍamān of the period figuring as a minor chief, Kānchi being a Chōḻa viceroyalty. In the Rāyakōṭṭa† plates a Pallava king by name Skandaśishya, who must have been earlier than

---

* *Annual Report for Epigraphy*, 1905–06, Part II, p. 25, and *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. VIII, pp. 295 and 319.

† No. 8: *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. V.

Vishṇugōpa claims descent from Aśvattāman through a Nāga princess. Perhaps by this time the origin of Iḷandirayan had been so far forgotten as to make this credible. These considerations leads us to an earlier period for Karikāla. This personage is associated with Puhār even in tradition, and the 'Jewel-Belt' tells as in unmistakable language *that Puhār was submerged in Kiḷḷi's reign.* All the poems in the *Puṟanānūṟu* about Kiḷḷi, a number of them with distinguishing epithets, connect them with Uraiyūr, and none of them is connected with Puhār. Uraiyūr figures as a considerable town in the 'Epic of the Anklet.' Even the *Śiṟupāṇāṟṟuppaḍai* does not mention Puhār. This is a very important circumstance as will appear presently.

When *Śeṅguṭṭuvan* performed an elaborate sacrifice on the occasion of *the consecration of the temple to Pattinī Dēvi* (the heroine of the 'Anklet'), *there was present*, among others, *Gajabāhu of Lanka*, surrounded by sea (as opposed to Māvilangai of Ērumānāṭṭu Nalliyakkōn). This Gajabāhu of Ceylon, Iḷam Cheḻiyan of Madura, and Kiḷḷi of Uraiyūr, built temples to the same deity, following the lead of the Cēra. The question now is whether this Gajabāhu is the first or the second of the name. The first Gajabāhu ruled as monarch of all Ceylon from A.D. 113–135; the second as one of three from A. D. 1142—1164 as in the list appended to Miss Duff's *Chronology of India*. Dr. Hultzsch's challenge to the Honourable Mr. Coomarasamy is to establish by internal evidence that the Gajabāhu mentioned was the first and not the second of the name. As to the other part of his objection, it must have become

clear from the above that for the myth about Kiḻḻi, later writers alone are responsible; and enough direct evidence has been adduced to show that Karikāla was ruling at Puhār when Kōvalan began life as a married man, and that his daughter was the wife of the Cēra king then reigning. To return to Gajabāhu; let us for the sake of argument take him to be the second of the name. We know something of the history of South India in the middle of the 12th century and the geographical distribution of powers. The Chōḻa rulers ought to have been either Vikrama or Kulōttunga; the rulers of Madura, either Vīra Pāṇḍyan or Vikrama Pāṇḍyan, the sovereigns of the Cēra country were Vīra Kēraḷa Varman and Vīra Ravi Varman; of the Mysore country, Vishṇuvardhana and his son, Narasimha. There were no separate rulers at Kānchi, except in the sense that it was an alternative capital of the Chōḻas. There was an Adiyamān, no doubt, about this period (somewhat earlier), but he was the Chōḻa viceroy at Talakad (not connected with Tagaḍūr), who was driven across the Kāvēri by Ganga Rāja, the famous general of Vishṇuvardhana. There were no Kongu rulers such as are mentioned in the 'Epic of the Anklet.' Gajabāhu himself was in no plight to come to Vañji* (Karūr) at the mouth of the Pērār, not far from the modern Kranganur (Koḍungalūr). Gajabāhu was fighting his own battles nearer home with his two neighbours, Mānabharaṇa and Parākramabāhu, and it was all he could do to keep himself from being permanently overwhelmed.

---

* Vañji itself was not the capital of the Cēra at the time. The capital of Kēraḷa was then Quilon, and during the period of the Chōḻa ascendency (A. D. 900—1300).

The first Gajabāhu invaded the Chōḻa country to bring back the inhabitants of Ceylon, carried off by the Chōḻa army on a previous invasion of the island during his father's reign; they were then in bondage at 'the city of Kāvēri in the country of Soḷi.' He brought back besides, the relics and the begging-bowl of the Buddha ("which aforetime had been carried away by the Dhamilas"). The *Rājaratnākari* while ascribing the same achievements to him, states that the Ceylonese went of their own accord "to serve at the river Kāvēri."* He is there said to have brought a number of the Tamils and settled them in Ceylon. In the *Rājavali*, however, there is an even more elaborate version. The ruler is there called Rājabāhu (which may be due to a mislection). He was accustomed to make solitary night-rounds; when he heard the wailings of a widow in her house, for her two sons had been taken captive by the king of "Soḷi Raṭṭa". The *adigars* (officers) failing to discover anything wrong, the king sent for the woman and learnt from her that 12,000 families had been carried away, "when the king of Soḷi Raṭṭa made his descent upon the island." The same achievements as in the previous account are recorded, with the adition "that the king of Ceylon also, upon that occasion brought away the foot ornaments of Pattinī Dēvi † and also the four arms of the gods." This Pattinī Dēvi could have been no other then the heroine of the epic, who was known

* Vol. II, pp. 57–58. This mention of the river instead of the town would show that when the *Rājaratnākari* was compiled the existence of the town was passing into oblivion.

† The distinction between the Chōḻa country and other parts of South India is not carefully made in the *Mahāvamśa*. Sometimes they specially talk of Soḷi Raṭṭa, at others of Malabar generally, meaning not the Malabar Coast necessarily, but India generally.

as Pattinī Dēvī or Pattini Kaḍavuḷ. This must have been regarded as a valuable relic in those days, when relics played such a prominent part in religion. As to the begging-bowl of Buddha, a bowl of extraordinary virtue had been brought by Maṇimēkhalā from an island south of Puhār, where there was a Buddha seat as well, which had the divine quality of letting people into the secrets of their former existence, a belief in which was one of the cardinal doctrines of Buddhism. The 'Jewel-Belt' also states that two Nāga kings fought for the possession of this Buddha-seat. These then are the native accounts of the Ceylonese chronicles with respect to Gajabāhu I ; but, unfortunately, reference to Pattinī Dēvi does not occur in the earlier compilations. This is matter for great regret. It must, however, be noticed that all these works were compiled from earlier writings and living tradition. Here follows what the learned translator of the works has to say about them :—" So carefully has the text been handed down that the discrepancies found to exist between the more ancient and modern copies are very slight indeed. The *Rājāvaḷi* is a work of different hands and compiled from local histories ; it is used as a corollary or addition to the two preceding works, continuing the narative through the struggles between the Portuguese and their rivals, the Dutch, etc".

All tradition, therefore, and the historical circumstances attending the stories of these epics point to the *first Gajabāhu*, as the Ceylon ruler who was present at the celebration of the sacrifice by Śeṅguṭṭuvan Śēra and if the *Rājāvaḷi* could be relied on, the conclusion would be forced

upon us. As it is, however, there is but little ground to connect these events with the second Gajabāhu, as some scholars would have it.

As to *the date of the first Gajabāhu, the chronicle gives A. D. 113—135* as the period of his reign. Whatever be the real worth of this actual date, we have little reason to regard that of his successor namesake as inaccurate. It has been pointed out that the middle of the 12th century could not possibly be the time when the poets flourished. There is the *Kalingattupparaṇi*, the date of composition of which could not have been much later than 1111 A.D., certainly not later than 1118 A.D. Sundaramūrti Nāyanār, whom the late Mr. Sundaram Pillai placed in the 8th century A.D. refers to Pāri,* the patron of Kapilar, and the general tenor of the epic points to Buddhistic times, which the 12th century was not. Taking the Buddha Nirvāṇa, at 487 B.C. instead of 543 B.C., as recognised by most authorities now, the years of Gajabāhu I go up to 162—191 A.D. Until it is proved that the earlier dates of the *Mahāvamsa* are unreliable † (except for this error), these dates will have to stand, and the *period of the greatest literary activity in Tamil must thus be put down as the 2nd and 3rd centuries of the Christian era*

* The reference is to the complaint which the devotee makes in respect to the lack of liberality in people in his days, although one should choose to describe a miser as a patron liberal as 'Pāri,' much as Bacon complains of learned men turning Faustina into Lucretia.

† Prof. Rhys Davids finds the chronicle borne out in important details by the inscriptions among the finds of the Sānchī Tope, etc. (*Buddhist India*, pp. 299-300), page 1 *et seq*; *J. R. A. S.*, 1908; *Indian Review*, May, 1908; the *Date of the Buddha* by Mr. Gopala Iyer.

at the latest. This will be quite consistent with the power of the Tamils in the centuries preceding the Christian era, when they several times invaded Ceylon and imposed themselves on the Ceylonese as usurpers, about the middle of the 1st century B.C. These facts coupled with the emperor Asoka's reference to these Tamil powers, along with the five Hellenistic potentates, warrants great probability with respect to the high state of civilisation of the Tamils.

Besides the mentton of Gajabāhu, we find mention of a number of other rulers in the course of the 'Epic of the Anklet,' who were some of them friendly and others hostile. The friendly kings were the "hundred *karnas*," who provided Śeṅguṭṭuvan with a fleet of ships with which to cross the Ganges, when he invaded the Northern country to punish Kanaka and Vijaya, sons of Bālakumāra who spoke disparagingly of the Tamil rulers. These brothers were helped by Uttara, Vichitra, Rudra, Bhairava, Chitra, Singa, Dhunuttara and Śvēta.* Mr. Kanakasabhai takes the "hundred *karnas*" as equal to Śātakarṇin of the *Matsya-purāṇa*. But against this, there is the objection that the Tamil poet mentions 'the hundred persons, the *karnas*' † and in one place the author even speaks of "the *karnas*" without the hundred.‡ Besides, as would appear from Dr. Bhandarkar's *Dakhan*, the name Śātakarṇin was that of a dynasty and not of only one ruler. The name Śātakarṇi alone appears in the early parts of the list and

* *S. A.*, Canto xxvi, ll. 180-185.

† *S. A.*, Canto xxvi, l. 149.

‡ *S. A.*, Canto xxvii, p. 177.

the date is 40 B.C. to A.D. 16 (see 166, *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. I., Part II.) The word itself could be taken to mean "keen-eared" (rather than hundred-eared) figuratively. It is hard to understand how a contemporary could have rendered it with the number attached not to the ears but to men. Besides, these were ruling in Southern India, although Magadha was included in their dominions. So then, even if the "hundred *karnas*" meant Śātakarṇin, the particular sovereign might have been Yagña Śrī who ruled from A.D. 154—174 in the Mahārāshṭra, and A.D. 172—202 in Telingana. If this be so, we have also a Vijaya, mentioned in all the *purāṇas*, who was in Telingana from A.D. 202—208, but as against this, there is the objection that Śeṅguṭṭuvan crossed the Ganges and fought with Vijaya and his brother on the northern bank of the Ganges. This notwithstanding, that Śeṅguṭṭuvan must have flourished about this time, could be inferred from the fact that Śeṅguṭṭuvan's father, Pāṇḍyan Neḍum Cheḻiyan and Karikāla all claim victory over the Aryan forces. It is very likely that the Tamīl forces helped in the overthrow of the foreigners by Gōtamīputrā Śātakarṇi * and the direct mention of gifts to Karikāla by the Rājas of Bundelkhand (Vajranāḍu). Magadha and Mālva (Avanti) could

* This is the more likely, as the Śaka Nahapana and his successor, Rishabadata, ruled over the Mahārāshṭra, with Junnār for their capital, and their territory extended up to Malabar. This dynasty, together with that of Chashṭana in Mālva, was overthrown by Gōtamīputra Sātakarṇi and his son, Pulimayi, among whose possessions we find "the regions of the Malaya and the Sahya." These Andhrabhrityas came from Dhanakaṭaka near Guntur, and driving back the usurpers, recovered their ancestral dominions. (Introduction to *Literary Remains of Dr. Bhau Dhaji*, page 25, and Dr. Bhandarkar's *Dakhan*, Secs. iv, v, and vi).

not be altogether a figment of the imagination, since it is so very definite. *All circumstances attending points to the 2nd century A. D. as the era of Śeṅguṭṭuvan* ; and the era of the greatest literary activity may be taken to be the 2nd and 3rd centuries after Christ.

Buddhism was introduced into South India during the last quarter of the 3rd century B. C. It must have taken some time to strike root, and in those days must have been somewhat slow in spreading. Judging from the exposition of it, as shown in the 'Jewel-Belt,' we might take it that it was as yet so free from any element of corruption as to evoke the admiration of even Christian scholars, like the learned translator of the Ceylonese chronicles. The early centuries after Christ may, therefore, be regarded as the age of Buddhistic ascendency in South India. When Fa Hien was travelling in India, there was already the early signs of revulsion, and Brahmanism returned to the fray. In the next two or three centuries Buddhism was swept off the country and the restoration of Brahmanism was completed when Hiuen Tsang came to India, chiefly through the agency in the Tamil country of the earlier Śaiva devotees and some among the Vaishṇava. From this time the struggle is not so much between Buddhism and Brahmanism, as between the latter and Jainism.

In the first centuries of the Christian era then, we find India south of the Tungabhadra thus politically divided. If we start at the source of the Kāvēri and follow its course till it meets the Amarāvati near Karūr, and then go up the latter river continuing our journey till we reach the Palnis and the Western Ghats, we shall have marked the

land-boundary of the Cēra sphere of influence. If we take a straight south-easterly line from Karūr till we reach the sea, east of the Zamindari of Sivaganga and south of the old Chōḻa town of Toṇḍi, the south of this line would be the Pāṇḍya, and north of it the Chōḻa sphere of influence. It must not be understood that the territory allotted to each power was always directly under it. The frontier regions were always of doubtful allegiance, as could be seen from the care with which rulers in those days fortified and strengthened frontier towns. So far as the Chōḻas were concerned, they had always prominently before them the strategical advantages of Uraiyūr on the west and Kānchi on the north, although their chief city was Puhār on the sea-coast. Karūr was the meeting place of the three powers and it was in its neighbourhood that many a hard-fought battle took place. This central region, particularly the hilly portion, was therefore filled with petty chieftancies owing allegiance, so long as it could be enforced, to one or other of these powers constituting a group of frontier "buffer states." Thus there was Irungōvēḷ north of the Mysore District and on the frontier of Coorg. Next to him was the Adiyamān in the southern-half of the Mysore District and part of Salem with his headquarters at Tagaḍūr. He belonged to the Cēra family. South of this must have been the territory of Pēhan with Nallūr for his headquarters, the country round the Palnis; between the two last was probably Paṛambunāḍu of Pāri. Next follows the Kongu country, which we might put down as including a part of the Coimbatore and Salem Districts. In a line east of this is the hill country of Kāri with its headquarters, Tirukkōvilūr. South of this is the Chōḻa country proper, and north

the province or kingdom, according to circumstances, of Kānchi. South of the Palghat gap and in the Pāṇḍya country was the chieftaincy of Āay and Podiyil Hill in the Western Ghats. On the opposite side rond Korkai were the territories of Evvi. During the latter part of the reign of Śeṅguṭṭuvan there was a Cēra, probably a viceroy only, holding a tract of country extending from the Kolli Malais* to Toṇḍi on the coast, with the Chōḷa and Pāṇḍya countries on either side. This was the prince Cēra of "elephant-look" (probably he had small deep-set eyes). The above appears to have been the geographical division of the country. This kaleidascopic arrangement vanished and another pattern presented itself with every turn that affairs took.

If we call the age under consideration the age of the Cēra ascendency, as Śeṅguṭṭuvan Śēra appears to have been at one time in his life the arbiter of the destinies of this part of the country, we pass on gradually from this into a struggle, the Cēra supremacy being shaken by the Pāṇḍyan. Here we lose the thread till we come to about A.D. 400, when the Pallavas rise into importance. The Pallava ascendency begins with Vishṇugōpa of Kānchi, the contemporary of Samudragupta, and reaches its grand climacteric under Narasimhavarman, the destroyer of Badami (Vātāpi), the Chāḷukya capital about 640 A.D. A century hence we find the Gangas and Pāṇḍyas fighting near Kumbhakonam. This *role* the Pāṇḍyas play several times in history. Their position at the farthest end of the peninsula

---

* This was the tract taken from Śrī by his enemy Kāri and given to the Cēra.

gives them safety. It is only when the frontier powers fall, that we see the Pāṇḍyas asserting themselves. Throughout history the South Indian powers had to oppose the incursion of the Dakhan powers, and from the rise of the Pallavas we can have a clear idea of the general position of the South Indian powers. Varaguṇa Pāṇḍyan succeeded in chasing the Gangas back into their territory. In another century a new dynasty of the Chōḻas rise into eminence and achieve an ascendency, matched only by that of the later empire of Vijayanagar in its best days. The decline of the Chōḻas again brings into prominence the Pāṇḍya in the south and the Hoyśalas in the north. Both alike of these powers are overwhelmed in that great wave of Moslem invasion under Malik Kāfūr. The Muhammadan is beaten back by the heroic efforts of a number of chiefs and this movement culminates in the establishment of the Vijayanagar empire in the middle of the 14th century. The fall of this empire brings the history of Hindu rule in South India practically to a close, and the Mahratta Empire belongs to a different chapter of Indian history.

[*Written in response to a request by the late Mr. L. C. Innes in 1903–4. Reprinted from the Indian Antiquary for 1908 ; Vol. XXXVII.*]

The chronology of the Sangam Works, so called, of Tamil Literature.

This subject has been, for very near a century, regarded as of the utmost importance by those engaged in research work as well as by those engaged in the study of Tamil, the eldest among the sisterhood of languages known commonly the Dravidian languages. In the early years of the last century Bishop Caldwell made what perhaps was then the most successful attempt at fixing the age of this body of literature and brought what he called 'the Augustan Age of Tamil Literature' to the 9th or 10th century of the Christian era. Since then there have been a series of attempts, several of them merely restating Caldwell's conclusions; while various others were made to controvert them and give a higher antiquity to this Augustan age. The recent editors of Caldwell's Comparative Grammar allow the following statement to remain:—"The period of the predominance of Jainas (the predominance in intellect and learning give rarely a predominance in political power) was the Augustan Age of Tamil Literature, the period when the Madura College, a literary association, appears to have flourished and when the *Kuṛaḷ*, the *Chintāmaṇi*, and classical vocabularies and grammars were written." This period is ascribed to the 9th or 10th century A.D. and the editors are content to leave this with a foot note: "Modern researches point to a much earlier date than that given

here". This Caldwellian tradition has been handed on almost unbroken to the present time. We find the statement repeated with hardly any modification in Reinhold Rost's article on Tamil, in the 11th edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica; and with some slight modification in Frazer's "A Literary History of India" and the new edition of the Imperial Gazetteer of India Volume II. This position did not go unchallenged, however. It was the late Mr. P. Sundaram Pillai of Trivandrum who took up the challenge first. In one or two essays that he contributed on this particular subject he did much destructive work, but did not essay in constructive work relating to this particular period, though it must be said to his credit that he succeeded in fixing one or two mile-stones in Tamil Literature. The greatest constructive effort was made by another lamented Tamil scholar, the late Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai, whose work, however, was marred by a too ambitious attempt at working out details before the main lines could hardly be regarded as fixed. This defect notwithstanding, his work brought together a great deal of matter which had remained buried in manuscripts inaccessible even to the learned, and understood, if accessible, by but a few. This work was done by him in the last decade of the last century and in the first two or three years of the present. It was about the end of this scholar's work that a much respected European Scholar, connected intimately with Madras, both as occupying an honoured place upon the High Court bench, and holding the position of the Vice-Chancellor of our University, took up the question and restated the case in support of Caldwell's theory with much force, considerable learning and great judgment. This was the late Mr. L. C.

Innes who discussed the whole question of the various periods of Tamil Literature in what was then the Imperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review, in an article entitled the Age of Māṇikkavāśagar. One small identification in it in the fixing of this Augustan Age drew my attention to this particular investigation and I raised, by no means a respectful, protest against it in a short article which I contributed to the Christian College Magazine. The letter which he wrote in reply to this protest, of which I sent him a printed copy, led me on, thanks to the stimulus of that judicial minded good man, to make an effort at fixing this Augustan Age from my point of view. "The Augustan Age of Tamil Literature" was written by me in the first instance for the Madras Review and published, again in a somewhat modified form, in the Indian Antiquary as a general introduction to a contemplated series of articles on "Celebrities in Tamil Literature", poets and patrons alike. This was again published, with permission, by the Tamilian Archæological Society in the Tamil Antiquary. This essay attempted to set forth the then available evidence both literary and historical leading to the following conclusions :—

(1) "That there was an age of great literary activity in Tamil to warrant the existence of a body like the traditional Śaṅgam".

(2) "That the period of the greatest Śaṅgam activity was the age when Śeṅguṭṭuvan Śēra was a prominent character in South Indian politics".

(3) "That this age of Śeṅguṭṭuvan was the second century of the Christian era."

(4) "That these conclusions find support in what is known of the later history of South India.

Since this was published there have been to my knowledge two constructive efforts of which one is that contained in a life of Śenguṭṭuvan in Tamil written by Pandit M. Ragava Aiyangar of the Tamil Lexicon Office, read in the first instance as an essay before the Tamil Śangam at its meeting in Rāmnād in May 1913. The other is a final statement, of various efforts in detail in regard to this matter, by Mr. Subramaniya Iyer, Assistant Epigraphist to the Government of Madras, in the Christian College Magazine of the year 1914, in an article entitled the Ancient History of the Pāṇḍya Country. I propose attempting to examine the position of these two scholars and restate my case in the light of the criticism thus made to see how far my position has to be revised and to what extent it requires to be altered.

Taking the latter first the point that calls for attention is that he relies, for settling this much disputed chronology, on a few copper-plate grants of the Pāṇḍya Kings, and one or two stone inscriptions relating to them, and hopes from these aids to settle the question finally. The following long extracts from his paper would exhibit his position in respect of the others who had carried on similar investigations before him most fairly to himself.

'As has been remarked already the dates when these poems were composed are not given anywhere. To settle this question with any amount of probability, we are naturally forced to look for information from external

sources. Even in this direction, there was not much to help us till recently. The discovery of the Śinnamanūr plates and the information supplied in he Vēḷvikkuḍi grant of the Pāṇḍya kings have placed a lot of reliable matter before the earnest student of ancient history and a careful examination of their contents is sure to enable him to arrive at a satisfactory solution which has all along been sought for in vain. The previous scarcity of materials served only to mislead inquiries.'

'For purposes of history we can freely adopt the accounts given in *Puṟanāṉūṟu*, *Pattuppāṭṭu*, *Padiṟṟuppattu* etc. These poems have been edited in an admirable way by Mahāmahōpādyāya V. Swaminathier who gives now and then short notices of *Aham* which has not yet appeared in print. Although *Śilappadhikāram* and *Maṇimēkhalai* are classed among the Śaṅgam works, I entertain serious doubts as to whether they speak of contemporary kings and events, and it may be said that great caution is necessary before utilising wholesale the materials contained in them. I know *I am mortally wounding the feelings of several savants of Tamil Literature who would at once pour forth a volume of abuse if I were considered a worthy rival of theirs.* Fortunately I am not such a one. But all the same I wish to record here my reasons for holding this position. The two works in question contain a romantic account of a certain Kaṇṇaki famed for chastity and of Maṇimēkhalā the daughter of a hetaira of Kaṇṇaki's husband Kōvalan. Enraged at an unreasonable murder of her husband, Kaṇṇaki miraculously sets fire to the city of Madura, whereupon the Pāṇḍya king struck down by remorse for the unjust act

*kills himself.** A heavenly palanquin is seen to descend to earth to carry Kaṇṇaki to the abode of the gods. The people who observed this erect a shrine for her worship and this is at once followed by the initiation of the same worship in other countries both in and out of India. The romantic nature of the story will not fail to strike any one at the very outset. I for one would not grant that it relates to contemporary events. On the other hand it would be natural to view the legend as a story spun out by the poets, if not wholly from their imagination, at least with liberal addition to traditional beliefs extant at the time, of events long past. Is it possible, I ask, that a person, however virtuous he or she may be, would be invested with divinity even at the very moment of death? In my opinion, which I think will be shared by many, the story of the person should have remained in the memory of the people for a long time before any halo of divinity could gather round it.† It passes one's comprehension to imagine that people should have set about erecting a temple for a heroine at or soon after the time of her death.'

'I ask further how long it would have taken for her fame not only to spread but to strike such deep root in other countries as to cause her image to be enshrined in costly temples. In this connection I would request the

* The poet merely says he died upon the throne where he was seated at the time.

† History does record various instances of canonization of ordinary people in Europe while yet alive. Augustus was deified during life and history knows that there was a temple to him in India—on West Coast where Kaṇṇaki had her first shrine. Ptolemy II and his sister-wife were given a similar apotheosis during life by their loving but perhaps superstitiously credulous subjects.

reader to bear in mind that she was neither a royal personage nor a religious prophetess. In all possibility, if the story is due to a development of events taken from life, it must have been written long after Kaṇṇaki had been deified. As such we cannot assume the contemporaneousness of the kings mentioned in these works with the date of their composition. My own views is that the authors, not knowing the time when the kings mentioned by them individually flourished, have treated persons belonging to different ages as contemporaries and thus brought together a Gajabāhu, a Neḍunjeḻiyan and a Karikāla as living at the same time. In my articles on the date and times of the last two kings, I have adduced reasons to prove that they must have lived at least a century apart. And I would further point out here that Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai's indentification of *Nūṟṟangaṇṇan* mentioned in the *Śilappadhikāram* with Śātakarṇi is entirely untenable, because there is no warrant for the reading Śatakarṇi of the name Śātakarṇi which we find in all inscriptions and coins. Though attempts at translating proper names are not quite uncommon, yet it would seem that in this case *Nūṟṟangaṇṇan* is not a translation of Śātakarṇi. If the Tamil name was the result of perfect translation, we should have expected Nūṟṟangādan instead. No foreigner has ever dealt with proper names in this fashion. We have the mention of Indian kings and geographical places by Greek and Roman writers and by the Chinese pilgrims who visited India. I may note that none of them has adopted the novel method.* And again it is a wonder that a similar attempt

* Is this true? What does Phrūrion stand for in Ptolemy's Geography of the Coromandel Coast?

at translation was not made in the case of the other name Gajabāhu into Yānaikkai.* I would further state that it you examine carefully the contents of *Maṇimēkhalai*, you find mentioned in this work assigned to the second century A.D., systems of belief and philosophy that could not have struck root till the eight and ninth centuries.

'The Honourable Dewan Bahadur L. D. Swamikannu Pillai very kindly furnishes the following note on the question of the date of *Śilappadhikāram* and *Chintāmaṇi* :—

"As regards the date of composition of *Śilappadhikāram* I have found that the details given by Aḍiyārkkunallār in நாடுகாண்காதை and the prophecy about "ஆடித்திங்கள் ஆரிருள்பக்கத்து-அழல்சேர் குட்டத் தட்டமி ஞான்று-வெள்ளி வாரத்து", etc., are satisfied in only one year between A.D. 1 and A.D. 1,300, *i.e.*, A.D. 756. Similarly I have quite recently found that the details given in *Jīvakachintamaṇi* in காந்தருவதத்தையாரிலம்பகம் (text regarding the Muhūrtam for construction of காணக்கிடங்கு and commentary by Nachchinārkkiniyār on the 1st verse) are correct for only one year, A.D. 816."

"In either case the actual composition of the poems may have followed the respective dates by 60 to 80 years, the ordinary period for which Panchāngams are preserved.† My view is that the poets could have obtained the details only from a contemporary Panchānga, if indeed they did not find the details in the materials used by them for the

* What about ஓவிய சேனன் (Ōviyasēna) for Chitrāsēna in this very author ?

† If a Panchāngam was used for the purpose.

poems. In the case of *Jīvakachintāmaṇi* there were materials on hand."

"The interval between this composition of சிலப்பதிகாரம் and சீவகசிந்தாமணி was only about 60 or 70 years or at most about 150 years, not 700 years as supposed by Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai and others".

'We can safely, accept Mr. Swamikannu Pillai's date, A.D. 756,* for *Śilappadhikāram*. Still, we cannot but maintain that the matter contained in this and other works of a similar nature is useless for purposes of history. If we are asked to explain further why we adopt the accounts furnished in *Puṛanāṉūṛu* and *Pattuppāṭṭu* as come down to us from the hand of Perumdēvanār,—an author who cannot be said to have lived earlier than the date (A.D. 756) assigned to *Śilappadhikāram*—we would say that Perumdēvanār stands in the high position of an editor of some older and trustworthy *historical documents of great merit*,† while the authors of *Śilappadhikāram* and other similar works appear before us *as mere story tellers and that their compositions are full of improbabilities, impossibilities and inconsistencies.*'

The first point in the extracts to call for a word by way of remark is that the twin-epic, *Śilappadhikāram* and *Maṇimēkhalai*, is not to be used for purposes of history. He sets forth the reasons very elaborately thus :—

(1) He ascribes in consequence to the authors of the books an ignorance of contemporary rulers, and sees in the

* This is not his date. His date is 60 or 70 years later, according to him.

† How are these historical? Were they written to hand down history?

combination of a Gajabāhu, a Neḍumśeḻiyan and a Karikāla a confusion of chronology.

(2) He further refers to Mr. Kanakasabhai's identification of Śātakarṇi with "Nūṟṟangaṇṇan" as unwarranted.

(3) He next sets down that the work *Maṇimēkhalai* contains reference to system of belief and philosophy that could not have struck root till the 8th and the 9th centuries.

(4) And lastly he quotes Mr. Swamikannu Pillai, with approval, to point out that the *Śilappadhikāram* could have been composed only in A.D. 756, slightly overstating his authority.

In regard to the first point it may be stated at once that there is no immutable psychological law that prevents contemporaries from believing in the supernatural. In discussing the mental attitude of people separated many centuries from us it is a natural error to import our ideas into their lives. The first essential to a study of this kind is an attitude of mind that can detach itself from its present outlook and carry itself back to another environment. If we are inclined to regard the story of Kaṇṇaki as "improbable, impossible and inconsistent" it does not necessarily follow that our ancestors, perhaps 13 or 14 hundred years ago, on Mr. Subramaniya Ayyar's own showing, had the same mental outlook as we have. Even so we cannot say of us to-day that there are not among us people who will not believe stories similar to those of the *Śilappadhikāram* in contemporary life, and it is hardly fair in any one to ascribe to those with whom he does not agree that they

make use of the works under consideration in the manner suggested by this remark. Nor does it make it necessary that the author should have lived centuries after the occurrence to share this belief. Granting for argument that he did not share the belief himself, but took up a story that was current and dealt with it in the manner that he has done but laying the scene in the contemporary Tamil India of his time, the author would still be within the bounds fixed by literary criticism to a poet. All that is claimed for the two books is that the background of the story is historical, and those who have used it so have more to support them than their critics. We shall consider the contemporaneity of the rulers mentioned in the work later.

In regard to the next point it is not clear where the expression *Nūṟṟangaṇṇan* comes from. Mr. Kanakasabhai has attempted to identify the Śātakarṇi of the *Śilappadhikāram* with the expression Nūṟṟuvar Kaṇṇar or merely Kaṇṇar; but of "Nūṟṟangaṇṇan" I am unable to see any reference either in Mr. Kanakasabhai's books or in the *Śilappadhikāram*. It may be stated, however, that Mr. Kanakasabhai's identification is hardly tenable on altogether other grounds. We do not agree with Mr. Subramaniya Ayyar that if one name happens to be translated for some reason (*e. g.*, Ōviyasēnan [ஓவியசேனன்] for Chitrasēna) though we may not know it, it does not follow that others should be.

In respect of the third point of his, one would wish to know the grounds upon which a general statement like that is put forward. What are the systems in *Maṇimēkhalai* that could not have come in before the 8th or the 9th

century and why? Where do these sysems go back for authority and in what form is it that the systems are found exhibited in the *Maṇimēkhalai*? These points ought to be cleared before a general statement like that will be accepted.

In regard to the last point, the Astronomical data that Mr. Swamikannu Pillai relies on are found in the work but imperfectly expressed, but are elaborated by the commentator who lived many centuries later than the author. It is more than doubthful if the author took up a Panchāngam to set down the date or to note its details. It strikes me that he noted a particularly inauspicious combination for a day such as the popular கேட்டை, மூட்டை, செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை, portending a coming storm of a violently destructive character. There is nothing to warrant that anything more was meant in the Astrological details than this. Whether that is sufficient to override all other considerations in ascribing particular dates to works seems to me exceedingly doubtful.

Going to the more constructive part of Mr. Subramaniya Ayyar's work we are face to tace with four inscriptions, namely.

(1) The Madras Museum plates of Jaṭilavarman.
(2) The smaller Śinnamanūr plates.
(3) The larger Śinnamanūr plates.
(4) The Vēḷvikkuḍi grant.

His whole system depends upon a series of identifications of the various persons referred to in these four grants. We should invite attention particularly to the identification of

No. 2 in the genealogical table constructed from the larger Śinnamanūr plates. This person's name occurs merely as Jaṭila, the equivalent of the Tamil Saḍaiyan. with no other detail to lead us to an identification. Mr. Ayyar has identified him with a Jaṭila whose name is found in the Ānaimalai inscriptions which are dated A. D. 770. This person is again equated with the last name in the Vēḷvikkuḍi grant which is itself undated, thus giving to this last person, the donor of the grant, the date A. D. 770. What is more, a minister, by name Mārankāri, whose name figures in the Ānaimalai Inscriptions, is described, in the Sanskrit portion, as Madhurakavi, Madhuratara and Sāstravid, and as a native of Karavandapuram. This minister Mr. Subramaniya Ayyar takes to be definitely the Vaishṇava Āḻvār, Madhurakavi, neglecting the caution with which the possibility of identification is advanced by both the late Mr. Venkayya and Mr. G. Venkoba Rao the publisher of the Ānaimalai inscriptions. On this identification rests the whole chronology of Mr. Subramaniya Ayyar's thesis. These identifications and the various grants have reference only to the Pāṇḍyas. The identification of Mārankāri with Madhurakavi seems almost impossible. If the tradition regarding Madhurakavi is accepted for one thing, it ought to be accepted for other things equally essential. Madhurakavi is by common tradition a Brahman and a native of Kōḷūr, and is not handed down, in Vaishṇava tradition at any rate, as an official of the importance that Mārankāri was. There is nothing in the ten stanzas ascribed to Madhurakavi to indicate that he was anything more than a pious devotee. On such a basis of identification and combination of the four records Mr. Subramaniya Ayyar constructs a genealogical table

beginning with Palyāgaśālai Mudukuḍumi Peruvaḻudi* and ending with Rājasimha, taken to be a contemporary of the Chōḻa Parāntaka I A. D. 907 to 953, on the ground that the latter's inscriptions state that he won a victory over a Pāṇḍya by name Rājasimha, which name unfortunately occurs twice in the larger Śinnamanūr plates themselves, with three generations between them. It will be clear from this how valueless would be the inferences based upon these grants which on Mr. Subramaniya Ayyar's own showing were composed in the 8th, 9th and 10th centuries, in regard to matters relating to even two or three centuries earlier at the very worst.

Immediately after the first name Palyāgaśālai Pāṇḍyan, the Vēḷvikkuḍi grant mentions a Kaḷabhra Interregnum. This Kaḷabhra Interregnum is taken to be an Interregnum brought on by a Karnāṭaka invasion, referred to in connection with the story of Mūrtināyanār in the *Periyapurāṇam*. Fixing up then a Pāṇḍya succession he proceeds next to enumerate 13 Pāṇḍya Kings whose names occur in Tamil Literature, and tries to identify the later ten with those mentioned in the grants, and ascribes to them dates ranging from the commencement of the 6th century A.D. to A.D. 650 which he makes the terminal date of Śeḻiyan Śēndan whom he identifies with the Neḍumśeḻiyan, the victor of Talaiyālangānam. This makes the whole course of identification simplicity itself. But there is however one grave difficulty in accepting this arrangement. The whole body

* Whose name, by the way, is brought into this grant to justify the name Vēḷvikkuḍi and establish a prior gift of the village without any organic connection.

of works called Śaṅgam works which have to do with these various Pāṇḍyas have not the slightest reference to the Pallavas. Still 500 to 650, at any rate the latter half of it, was the age of the great Pallavas and 650 would take us perhaps to the middle period of one of the greatest among the great Pallavas, Narasimha I, destroyer of Vātāpi, the burning of which is referred to in the *Periyapurāṇam*. Sambandar refers to the Pallava general who destroyed Vātāpi. It is very strange that the large body of poets who went about from court to court singing the praises of patrons, and received rewards from them have no reference to make of the Pallavas although several towns and forts and territories under Pallava rule come in largely for reference. This objection seems vital to this arrangement of chronology, and seems thoroughly to exemplify the defects of specialistic research of which Mr. Stanley A. Cook has the following remarks to make, in his "Study of Religions."

'The man who is specialistic in a single department may be a bar to progress because he is apt to overlook the importance of other special studies. His own convictions are the more intense when he associates them with his trained knowledge, and although he may realize that his own energy has brought him to this stage, and although he may recognize in some special field the need for other men of diverse types and tendencies, he may forget that it takes all kinds of people to make a world. The desire to promulgate and proselytize is characteristic of all men with strong convictions based on experience and knowledge, and they can be intolerant of others. *In research, social reform, and religion, there is a stage of development, born of an*

intense feeling of the completest equilibrium or harmony in one's world of thought that can manifest itself in impatience towards, or in a provoking superiority over, those who differ. Yet one must not deny to others that sense of harmony that has been gained by one's own efforts along one's own lines; and since the whole world of thought could be theoretically divided into numerous departments, the ideal in view is a harmonius adjustment of them all.'

Passing on now to Pandit Ragava Ayyangar's work, called Śēran Śeṅguṭṭuvan, in Tamil, we find him devote Chapter XIII of the book to the determination of the age in which Śeṅguṭṭuvan and his contemporaries flourished. Passing in rapid review the late Mr. Kanakasabhai's conclusion in regard to the matter, he lays down his main position somewhat as follows :—

It is well known that among the poets who constituted the Śaṅgam, Kapilar, Paraṇar, Nakkīrar, Māmūlanār and Śāttaṇār took a prominent place. Among this Māmūlanār appears, from certain poems included in the *Ahanānūṛu*, to have been contemporary with Chōḷa Karikāla, Śēralādan, Kaḷvar Kōmān Pulli; from this source also appears clearly that he was one who had travelled much in the various parts of the Tamil country and in countries north of it. This poet is taken to be contemporary with Śeṅguṭṭuvan Śēra, as he refers, in *Aham* 251, to a war between the Mauryas and a chief of Mōhūr which is taken to stand for the chief Paḷaiyan Māran who is said elsewhere to have fought against this Cēra. Quoting from *Aham* 265, *

---

* 'பல்புகழ் நிறைந்த வெல்போர் நந்தர்-சீர்மிகு பாடலிக் குழீஇக் கங்கை-நீர்முதற் கரந்த நிதியங் கொல்லோ.'

he refers Māmūlanār to a time subsequent to the destruction of Pāṭalīpura to which he sees a definite reference in the passage quoted. This is the first and in fact the strongest argument of his thesis for ascribing Śeṅguṭṭuvan to the 5th century A.D.; but he arrives at this result by a series of arguments which seem to me to find no justification in history. He interprets the expressions in the passage quoted as referring to the destruction of Pāṭalipura by the Ganges; whereas in actual fact it could mean no more than the disappearance of the great wealth that the Nandas collected in Pāṭalīpura, in the Ganges. This might well have been brought about by the Nandas themselves throwing it into the river, rather than let it fall into the hands of their enemies, in the revolution that subverted their dynasty. Starting from his peculiar interpretation of the passage he postulates the destruction of Pāṭalīpura by the flood of the Ganges and finds the period of such destruction in the time intervening the visits of the two Chinese travellers to India, namely, Fa Hian in the beginning of the 5th century and Hiuen Tsang in the second quarter of the 7th century A.D. He further equates the Mauryas who had invaded the territory of Paḻaiyan Māran, perhaps in a previous generation, with the army of the Gupta King, Samudragupta. He finds support for this in the mention of a Maṅṭarāja who is taken to be 'a King of Kēraḷa' and the same as Māndaram Śēral. The rest of his reasoning in the whole Chapter is of the same character and of minor consequence. Granting for the sake of argument that his interpretation of the passage quoted above is correct, it would be very difficult to justify Samudragupta and his army being referred to as Mauryas by a poet of the standing and reputation

of Māmūlanār. There is absolutely nothing in the pillar inscription* of Samudragupta to warrant this inference. The text of the inscription contains reference to a Kaurāḷaka Maṅṭarāja. He is mentioned along with Hastivarman of Vengi, Vishṇugōpa of Kānchi, Ugrasēna of Pālaka etc. There is absolutely nothing in the inscription to lead us to believe that Samudragupta's army passed south of Kānchi. That that Maṅṭarāja should be taken to be Māndaram Śēral is identification of the most unreasonable kind. The editor of the inscription, Dr. Fleet, did not understand what the term Kaurāḷaka stood for, and merely put forward a suggestion that it might be "Kairāḷaka" the equivalent of Kēraḷa". This suggestion is in a foot note, but as to the point whether the person referred to was a Kēraḷa prince at all he has offered no definite support. It has since been found that Kaurāḷaka is very probably a mere mislection for Kauṇāḷaka (of Kuṇāla) perhaps the region round about Kollēr lake.† But whatever it is, it is now certain that there is no reference whatsoever to Kēraḷa in the inscription. As to the destruction of Pāṭalīpura by flood there is no authority for the statement. The recent investigations on the site seem more to indicate a certain amount of destruction by fire very much more than by

* Kauśālaka-Māhēndra-Mahā kāntāraka-Vyāghrarāja-Kaurāḷaka-Maṅṭarāja - Paishṭāpuraka - Māhēndra giri Kauṭṭūraka - Svāmidatta-Airāṇḍapallaka-Damana-Kānchēyaka-Vishṇugōpa-Āvamuktaka.

Nīlarāja-Vaingēyaka-Hastivarmma - Pālakkak - Ograsēna - Daivarāshṭraka - Kubēra - Kausthalāpuraka - Dhananjayaprabhriti sarvva-dakshiṇāpatharāja-grahaṇa-mōksh-ānugraha - janita - pratāp-ōnmiśra-mahābhāgyasya.

† *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. VI, p. 3 note.

water, and the passage relied on cannot be held to support the interpretation put upon it. After all if one of the poems of Māmūlar makes reference in the past tense to the destruction of Pāṭali or to an invasion of the south by the Mauryas and a war in consequence between them and one of the Tamil chiefs of Mōhūr (near Madura) this can only mean that Māmūlanār knew of these occurrences. The various passages of Māmūlanār, most of which are unfortunately in the *Aham*, will hardly serve to establish his contemporaneity with all the incidents he might have found occasion to mention. The identification of Tadiyan with Tidiyan, and of Pidiyan with Paḷayan borders on the ludicrous. There is a further reference in the Jain work *Digambara Darśana* (ascribed to the 10th century) to the establishment of Drāviḍa Śaṅgam in Madura by Vajranandi in A. D. 470 (Samvat 526). There is nothing to prove that this was a Tamil Śaṅgam for the fostering of Tamil Literature. It may well be a Jain Saṅgam which would in the sense of being an assembly of Drāviḍa Jains or Tamil Jains, be a Drāviḍa Saṅgam, and may have had for its object some matter pertaining to the Jain religion. Thus then the elaborate reasoning exhibited in Chapter XIII of the work seems clearly to rest upon a very uncertain and slender basis. It is regrettable that a book which does exhibit considerable labour and puts in an eminently readable form matter buried in recondite works should be marred by this kind of reasoning, particularly in this Chapter and in Chapter VIII Part 2, where he tries to establish that the Vañji of the Cēras was the Karūr in the Trichinopoly District, where again we come upon a number of distortions of texts and a number of false identifications to establish his thesis.

The proper procedure in a case like this is to analyse the various works belonging to this particular group sort out the various kinds of historical evidence that we get, establish the undoubted contemporaneity of poets and patrons with a jealously critical eye, and look out for historical connections that will establish one or more synchronisms, and proceed on that basis to establish others.

Adopting this procedure the Śaṅgam works so called fall naturally into two classes :—Those dealing, according to the Tamil grammarians, with (1) *Ahapporuḷ*, and (2) *Puṛapporuḷ*. The distinction between these two broadly is that the one refers to subjective emotion which finds expression on various occasions and under various circumstances and has reference principally to Erotics ; the other refers to action and partakes more or less of the character of exhibition of valour in attack, defence and the various other aspects of war-like life. Of these two classes the latter is the more valuable for purposes of history and chronology, as it makes direct reference to various wars, battles, sieges etc. ; and one very special feature of such work is that poets composing in this strain always address their partons directly, thereby making it unmistakable that what they have to state in respect of a particular chieftain has reference to contemporary life. The other group, however, does not stand on an altogether similar footing. Poems in this group do make similar references though they are always of an indirect character and do not give such clear evidence of comtemporaneity in respect of their various statements. These works are *Puṛanānūṛu*, *Ahanānūṛu*, *Pattuppāṭṭu*,

Padiṟṟuppattu, Ainguṟunūṟu, Naṟṟiṇai, Kuṟundokai etc.*
I keep out from this group advisedly the two works *Śilappadhikāram* and *Maṇimēkhalai* to which I shall return later to see how far the almost contemptuous reference to them of Mr. Subramaniya Ayyar finds justification. Even so the number of poets and patrons that figure in the works are far too many to be dealt with in one lecture. I shall take occasion to deal with these more elaborately, and on a scale compatible with the degree of lucidity that a lay understanding would demand of necessity. I can do here nothing more than to illustrate the work to be done by one or two typical examples of a telling character. In taking up a question like this a student of research is pretty much in the position of a judge and not of an advocate. Feeling and sentiment are out of the question and the discovery of truth is the object in view. There are here as in the case of a judge the two questions coming up for examination: questions of fact, and questions of law. One has to examine facts before stating them as such; one has to examine the methods that he adopts in the choice of his facts as much as in their application. Bearing this in mind we have first of all to consider whether stone inscriptions and copper plate grants of better authority for events which could have taken place centuries before the inditing of these documents or literature that was composed ostensibly at the time to which they relate. These Śaṅgam works enumerated

---

* Of these all but the second have been edited in an excellent form, the large number by the veteran Pandit Saminatha Iyer but the last two are edited by two others whose labours deserve as much credit as the others. *Naṟṟiṇai* was published by the late Mr. Narayanasami Iyer of Kumbhakonam and *Kuṟundokai* by Pandit Rangasami Aiyangar of the Madrasa at Vaniambady.

above are, by common consent, such works of contemporary value and have therefore to be regarded as of higher authority. Mr. Subramaniya Ayyar takes Perumdēvanār as of high standing and authority in respect of these works because he was a cultivated scholar and responsible editor of these, though coming centuries after their composition. But he forgets this, at any rate he seems to, in claiming a similar kind of authority for the compilers of the inscriptions which he seems unmistakably to set over against this class of literature to the disadvantage of the latter. Taking the poet Paraṇar to exemplify this position and collecting together such facts as we could derive from him of an undoubtedly historical character, we can find the political condition of the Tamil land and the position of the Tamil chieftains in relation to one another, in the poet's generation.

In stanza 4 of *Puṟanānūru*, Paraṇar refers to a Chōḷa ruler Uruvapaḫrēriḷanjēṭchenni in the following terms :—'You are of the radiant beauty of the rising sun just emerging out of the sea, in his golden car of the fullest effulgence.' This king is known from other poems of the same class, but of other poets, to be the father of Karikāla. The terms in which Paraṇar chose to describe him in this poem raise the presumption that he was the ruler, Tigaḻoḷināyiṟṟēḻparineḍumtēr Chōḻan, the grandfather of Śeṅguṭṭuvan Śēra; but this is by the way. Poem 63 of the same collection relates that the Cēra king, Kuḍakko Neḍum Śēralādan, and the Chōḷa king, Vērpaḫaraḍakkai Peruvīrarkiḷḷi, had fought against each other and fallen on the field of battle. Another poet Kaḻāttalaiyār has also celebrated

the same king, in the same connection. Poems 141 and 142 both refer to Pēhan's liberality which is referred to by the somewhat later Nallūr Nattan, the author of *Śirupāṇārrup-paḍai.* Poems 144 and 145 are addressed to this chief when he had given up his wife in favour of a sweetheart. Paraṇar, Kapilar, Ariśil Kīḻār and Perunguṅṟūr Kīḻār interceded in behalf of the wife to good purpose. Such a reference as we get in these two poems is an absolutely unmistakable evidence of contemporaneity. Poem 343 refers to Muzires (Muśiri or Muyiri)* and states, in regard to it, that commodities brought from oversea were brought ashore by means of boats. The place was full of goods brought overland and from across the sea to be distributed among those in need, that might go there. *Naṟṟiṇai* 6 of the same author has a reference to Ōri 'of the good bow'. In *Aham* 396, Śeṅguṭṭuvan is celebrated, while there are references in the poem to the war around Nannan's Pāḻi hill-fort and to Migñili. There is further reference to the story of Ādi Mandi and Āṭṭaṇatti, and possibly to the defeat of Ōri. The poem also appears to be intended to celebrate the imprinting of the bow emblem of the Cēra on the Himālayas. Poem 62 of *Aham*, as also poem 208, refer to the famous Kollippāvai having been erected by the Gods. He later also refers to the war with Migñili round Pāḻi hill. It must be noted in this connection that the tradition regarding Kollippāvai is found very clearly regarded in the following poem of *Ahanānūṟu* by another author known as Kallāḍanār who refers in the same poem to Pāṇḍyan Neḍumśeḻiyan, victor at Talaiyālangānam. There is similar reference to another chieftain Pulli, robber chieftain of the Tirupati hills. There

* Compare *Aham* 148 of " Kāṭṭūr Tāyangaṇṇan."

is also a statement that Kāri, king of Muḷḷūr, killed Ōri and made over his territory round Kollimalais to the Cēra King. Poem 270 of *Naṟṟiṇai* refers to the story that Nannan captured the elephants of his enemy as well as their women folk, binding the elephants with ropes made out of the hair of the women cut off for the purpose. Poem 73 of *Kuṟundokai* has a very interesting reference to a class of warlike people called Kōśar who entered Nannan's territory after killing his state elephant. This warlike tribe of people are referred to in other poems of the same class, and almost in the same terms. One of them referring to their being 'men of united counsel' capable of hurling the irresistible "battering-ram". These are, in other poems, associated with Kongu, and are referred to as Kongu Iḷangōśar in the *Śilappadhikāram*. *Kuṟundokai* 292 gives in detail the story that Nannan killed a girl for having eaten a fruit that had fallen from one of the trees in his garden into a stream of running water and was being carried down by it. He would not accept the ransom offered of 9 times 9 elephants and a golden statue of the girl of her own weight. It must be said to the honour of the Tamils that his name was handed down to posterity branded "as Nannan the woman-killer". *Aham* 147 of the same author states that Āay Eyinan, known as the commander-in-chief of the Cēra, fought with Migñili and fell in the fight. Poem 152 has reference to Veḷiyan Tittan and his port known as Perunduṟai, and what looks a naval defeat of another chieftain Pinḍan in this place. There are allusions to Pāḻi hill and Naḷḷi. *Aham* 165 refers to the Kōśar 'of united counsel', and seems to refer to their location in Kongu. It also contains the names Anni and Migñili but the passage

is too corrupt to know the connection fully. *Aham* 372 refers to the capture of Tirukkōvilūr, the capital of Kāri, by Adiyamān of Tagaḍūr. That Paraṇar celebrated this incident is stated in plain terms by Avvaiyār, the poetess in poem 99 of *Puṛanāṉūṛu*.

From these references collected in this fashion we could form a more or less definite picture of the political divisions of the Tamil land in the generation of Paraṇar. This picture becomes very much more definite and clear, if we could collate it with similar imperfect pictures that we may form by a study of other single authors such as Paraṇar himself. We shall reserve that for a future occasion. Now taking Paraṇar alone we find him celebrate the Chōḷa who was father of Karikāla definitely as a contemporary, as also Śēramān Neḍum Śēralādan and the Chōḷa Vērpahaṛaḍakkai Peṛuvīraṛkkiḷḷi. This Chōḷa probably was either the father of Karikāla or his grandfather. We find this Paraṇar celebrating Śēran Śeṅguṭṭuvan in the fifth section of the *Padirrupattu*. We have already made reference to this author's direct reference to Adiyamān, Pēhan, Nannan, Kāri and others. These must therefore have come all in one generation, that is, the generation extending from the grandfather of Karikāla to the Cēra Śeṅguṭṭuvan. The period of time ascribed to any one of these chiefs must be a period that would fit in with this political condition of the Tamil land. It has already been pointed out that this somewhat vague picture of the political condition of the South is capable of being completed by bringing into collation the picture that can be made of it from other authors whose works have come down to us like those of Paraṇar.

Without going elaborately into that comparison I may at once state that the Tamil land was divided among the three kings; the Pāṇḍya with his capital at Madura, the Cēṛa with his capital at Vanji on the west coast, and the Chōḷa with his capital at Uraiyūr,* at the commencement of this generation. The intervening region and the border land of the north where a good deal of fight would have to be done was divided among a number of chiefs who were very often independent of the kings, and sometimes acknowledged allegiance to one or other of them. Of such we find mention in the writings of Paraṇar himself. The information that we obtain from him is confirmed and supplemented by various other poets among whom mention may be made of Māmūlanār from whom I have to draw for further information later on. It is this latter that makes mention of Pulicat as the Vaḍuka frontier (northerm frontier).† The corresponding frontier on the western side seems to have extended to the north of the Tuḷu country into which, as was noticed already, a new tribe with the name Kōśar effected entry in the days of Nannan.‡ Immediately to the

---

**Aham* 31. வென்றியொடு—வில்லலைத் துண்ணும் வல்லாண் வாழ்க்கை—தமிழ் கெழுமூவர்காக்கும்—மொழிபெயர் தேஎத்த பன்மலை யிறந்தே.

† *Kuṛum* 11. குல்லைக்கண்ணி வடுகர்முனையது - வல்வேற் காட்டினன்னாட்டும்பர்.

‡ *Aham* 15. மெய்ம்மலி பெரும்பூட் கோசர்-தோகை காவிற் றுளு நாட்டன்ன.

Kuṛum 73. நன்னனறுமா—கொன்று நாட்டிற் போக்கிய—வொன்றுமொழிக் கோசர்போல.

east of them were the territories of the two chiefs Vichchikkōn and Irungōvēḷ of Araiyam. just below this and along the hill region bordering the Western Ghats and the Eastern where they meet the Western was perhaps the chieftain Pāri of Parambunāḍu. To the east of it was the territory of Adiyamān of Tagaḍūr (Modern Dharmapuri), to the south-east of which was the territory of the chieftain Ōri with his territory round about the Kollimalais. Across into the South Arcot District, particularly the hilly portions of the west, was the territory of Kāri with his capital Tirukkōvilūr. Behind them, almost in a sort of second line, was the chieftain Pēhan with his territory round the Palnis; Āay round the Podiyil hill in the Madura and Tinnevelly districts; Evvi on the Coromandal coast with his territory embracing a part of the Pudukkōttai state and the District of Rāmnāḍ. There is another chief the Toṇḍaimān Iḷandirayan who was certainly the contemporary of Avvai and Adiyamān Anji, though not directly mentioned by Paraṇar. His capital was at Kānchi and he ruled the territory round Kānchi under Chōḷa suzerainty. We have besides to locate, from the works of Paraṇar himself, the Kōśar somewhere in the Kongu country. This seems the political distribution of the territory belonging properly to the Tamil land in the generation of Paraṇar the poet. Any age therefore that could be ascribed to the Śaṅgam, in which Paraṇar did play a prominent part, must exhibit more or less this condition of political distribution of territory in the Tamil country. Any age which, from what could be known of it, does not visualise this political division has therefore necessarily to be rejected. The question therefore now is whether the latter half of the

6th and the first half of the 7th century, fixed by Mr. Subramaniya Ayyar, or the 5th century to which Mr. Ragava Ayyangar assigns the Śaṅgam, fit in with the political circumstances thus shadowed forth from the works of Paraṇar. The first alternative is very easily disposed of. The period of a century from 560 to 650 was the period when the great Pallavas were prominent political factors in the south, and practically the whole of the Tamil country was under their influence in the northern half. The southern enclave was equally indisputably in the hands of the Pāṇḍyas among whom the most prominent character was the famous Kūn Pāṇḍyan or Sundara Pāṇḍyan or Niṅṛaśīr Neḍumāran. His contemporary of the north was Narasimhavarman I, Pallavamalla. Both of them had for their contemporaries alike the *Tēvārām* Hymners, Appar and Sambandar. There is no reflection of this political condition in the literature under examination, nor is there any prominent mention of the Pallavas at all, in the region where they held sway, about which however, Paraṇar has a very large number of references to make. While these literary men take the greatest pains always to distinguish one ruler from another of the same dynasty by giving to each the distinguishing epithet, it is not open to us to identify, without sufficient lead from our sources, one ruler with another without very substantial reasons. The identification of Śēndan Śēḻiyan of the cooper-plates with the Pāṇḍyan Neḍum Śeḻiyan of Talaiyālangānam fame is, to say the least, not proven. In regard to the historical value of the *Śilappadhikāram* and *Maṇimēkhalai* about which a few words must be said here by way of reply to Mr. Subramaniya Ayyar's contemptuous reference, which

betokens an amount of ignorance which would be inexcusable in one with any pretensions to scholarship. Śeṅguṭṭuvan Śēra figures prominently in both the works. The author of the first is younger brother of Śeṅguṭṭuvan. The author of the other is his friend and both of them worked at a subject, legendary or other, that caught their imagination and dealt with it poetically, laying the scene, however, in the contemporary Tamil India of their time. Now the question is, are we to accept the statement of this prince-poet when he speaks of his parentage or not, though he might choose to put it, as a poet, in the mouth of one under a spell? Are we not to accept his statement in regard to the achievements of his brother particularly when they happen to be confirmed in every detail by an independent poet Paraṇar who celebrates him in one section of another work *Padiṟṟupattu*? Those who have taken it upon themselves to use these poems know their responsibility obviously, and use the material presumably with critical care. It is just possible that there are differences of opinion in respect of a detail here or a detail there as being of a historical character or no. But a wholesale condemnation such as is found in the extract from Mr. Subramaniya Ayyar quoted above, can be but the off-spring of blank ignorance and an incapacity to appreciate other mental attitudes and situations.

Passing on now to the other period so far ascribed, the Pandit is perhaps on a little more safe ground, but the arguments with which he finds it necessary to buttress this position shows its weakness. I need only mention two points here:—(1) The erroneous and impossible identification

of Maṅṭarāja of Kurāḷa with Māndaramśēral of Kēraḷa which name, by the way, does not find mention to my knowledge in these works. (2) The equation of the Vambamōriyar with the army of invasion under Samudragupta. It has already been pointed out that the interpretation of the quotation regarding the Nandas is wrong altogether, and that it is so is proved by a similar passage in lines 4 and 5 of poem 251 of *Aham** ; but there are a number of references which carry the invasion of Mauryas up to Mōhūr of Paḻaiyan Māran. In one of these passages at any rate, the Pandit tries to establish the contemporaneity of this invasion with the Paḻaiyan Māran, which, from the text, is untenable. The term Mōhūr is used in the passage to stand for the chieftain of Mōhūr not necessarily Paḻaiyan Māran. That reference and the various other references to the Mauryas in Māmūlanār, as well as the reference to their cutting their way through rock in their march southwards, all of them do refer possibly to a great southward invasion† of the Mauryas, a newly-established dynasty. We know now beyond doubt, since the discovery of the new edict of Asoka at Maski in the Nizam's dominions, that Asoka's territory extended right down to the frontier of Mysore within the boundaries of which other edicts were discovered years ago. We know of no wars excepting the famous Kalinga war that Asoka carried on for purposes of conquest. Chandragupta not having had the time to do it, the further conquest of territories not included within his Empire but included

---

* அருந்துயர் கேட்பின்-நந்தன் வெறுக்கை யெய்தினும் மற்றவட்-டங்கலர் வாழி தோழி.

† *Aham* 69 and 281. மோரியர் seems the preferable reading in *Puṛam* 175. The blundering of the commentator is worth remarking.

within that of his grandson, historians ascribe to Chandragupta's son Bindusāra, the father of Asoka who himself held the viceroyalty of the southern frontiers with his capital at Vidīśa (Bhilsa, or better *Besnagar*).* The conquest of the south by the Mauryas must have therefore been made either by Bindusāra, the king, or, by the viceroy-prince, his son. The term Vaḍukar used in this connection by the Tamils is a general designation for all northerners, and indicates, in the various references before us, an onward move southwards of certain northern tribes of which we get perhaps the final glimpse in the movements of the Pallavas till they come into occupation of Kānchi and the extension of their power at least as far south as Trichinopoly and Kumbhakonam. All the passages of Māmūlanār, referring to the incidents, refer to them as past occurrences and not as contemporary events. This interpretation of the passages relating to northerners agrees very well with the claim of certain Tamil kings to having won victories over the Aryan army, which attribute is specifically given to the Pāṇḍyan Neḍum Śeḻiyan whose name figures in the *Śilappadhikāram*. Such a general movement against the north could on general considerations be postulated only of the period of confusion that followed the decline of Maurya power in the north and the rise, to the imperial position afterwards, of the Andhras and the Andhrabhrityas in succession. The fifth century is hardly the century in which we get anything like a glimpse of such a great movement of people. With this general position of affairs clearly before us, the Gajabāhu synchronism does not

* V. A. Smith's *Early History of India* (3rd edition) p. 149. Note the footnote containing the statement of Tāranātha, the Tibetan historian.

appear in the least impossible ; but appears on the contrary very highly probable. The information which could be gathered from the Ceylon Chronicle *Mahāvamśa* compiled in its present form in the 6th century; but from material put together in epic form at the commencement of the 4th century, from a written source traceable to the first century B.C., is not as unreliable as it is too readily taken to be. If that Buddhist chronicle does not refer to Pattinīdēvi in so many plain words we have no right to* expect it ; but that does not invalidate the existence of a Gajabāhu or of his visit to the court of Śeṅguṭṭuvan Śēra. The synchronism thus established must, it seems to me, stand ; no satisfactory reason having been put forward so far to invalidate it. The newer information only goes so far to confirm it. The tradition of Pattini has taken such a hold upon the people of Ceylon that it is quite likely it was introduced under the favourable auspices inferable from the *Śilappadhikāram*, though naturally the Buddhist chronicle of the *Mahāvihāra* omits mention of it.†

[*A lecture delivered under the auspices of the Pachaiyappa's College Tamil Śaṅgam on the 7th March 1917 in the Pachaiyappa's Hall, with the Hon'ble Dewan Bahadur P. Rajagopalachariar, C.I.E., in the Chair.*]

---

* It must be noted, however, that other chronicles, which may reach back to similar old sources, do mention the incident specifically. (Vide Upham's *Rājaratnācari* and *Rājāvaḷi*.

† Indian Antiquary, Vol. XLV, pp. 72-78.

India at the Dawn of the Christian Era.

India the wonderland of the east, as it is even now called, was made known to the west, when the world-conqueror, Alexander the Great, forced open her gates on the north-west. Our knowledge of India at all of a definite character may be said to extend no farther than this period, as, according to the most recent authority, his connexion with India was not much more than a great raid. It is matter of common knowledge that he had to give up his idea of carrying his conquests right up to the eastern limits of the land (according to his own notion of the configuration of the earth), owing to a mutiny among his soldiers headed by his cavalry commander Koinos. Before leaving India, however, he divided his conquests on this side of the Indian Caucasus into three viceroyalties as follows :—

I. Paropanisadae, the country west of the Indus, with Oxyartes, the father of Roxana, for its viceroy.

II. The Punjab including in it the kingdom of Taxila, and that of Porus, that of the Sophytes together with the territories of the Oxydrachoi and the Malloi, under the viceroy Philip, son of Machetas ; leaving the civil administration in the hands of the native princes.

III. Sindh including the kingdom of Mousikanos, Oxykanos, Sambus and Maeris of Patalene under Peithon, the son of Agenor, for its viceroy.

Philip was murdered in a mutiny, before the death of Alexander, and his place was taken by Eudamos who remained in India till called away in 317 B. C. to help Eumenes against Antigonus of Asia, the most powerful among the Diadochi (the generals who divided Alexander's amongst themselves). When the Macedonian Empire was partitioned a second time in 321 B. C. (consequent on the death of Perdiccas, the regent of the first partition), the Indian province, east of the Indus, was left out of account, as Peithon had to withdraw to the western bank of the great river. About 305 B. C. Seleucus Nikator made an attempt to revive the empire of Alexander in this region, but had to relinquish his hold upon the whole of Afghanistan, and enter into a humiliating treaty with Chandragupta, the Maurya emperor of India. This personage is believed to have been in the camp of Alexander in the Punjab, and, thrown upon his own resources as the great Macedonian turned away from the banks of the Ravi, he took advantage of the confusion resulting from the departure of Alexander to overthrow the ruling Nanda in Magadha, and set himself up as the first emperor of India known to history. In the course of fifteen years he was able to make himself so strong as to fight Seleucus not only on equal terms but also to extort from him such a valuable cession of territory as Afghanistan up to the Hindu-Kush. For three generations this dynasty held its power undiminished. His grandson Asoka, the great Buddhist Emperor of India, was able to hold his own with the successors of Seleucus, and maintained with them the diplomatic relations thus begun by his grandfather. It seems to be well attested that both Seleucus Nikator and Ptolemy Philadelphus had sent

ambassadors to the courts of Chandragupta and Bindusāra, although scholars are not wanting yet who consider the particular edict of Asoka, a mere boast. With the death of Asoka about 230 B. C. the Mauryan empire loses its hold upon the more powerful and distant of its vassals, and the days of the dynasty are numbered.

From this event to the year A. D. 319 the date of the rise to power of the Imperial Guptas, the history of India is yet quite uncertain, although we are able to gain a few glimpses as to the general features of the history of that period. The Asiatic empire of the Seleucidae was attacked simultaneously by the Romans and the Gauls from the west and north-west, and the Parthians from the east. About the beginning of the second century B. C., Parthia made good her independence under Arsakes Mithridates I, and Baktria under Eukratides.* This was but the reflex action of the movements of the nomad tribes in the far-off plains of Mongolia. The great tribe of the Hiung-nu fell, with all the fervour of neighbourly love, upon the Yuet-chi, and dislodged them from their then habitat in the plains of Zungaria. These in their turn fell upon the Wu-sung, killed the Wu-sung chieftain in battle, and marched further upon the region then in the occupation of the Se, Sŏk or Śakas. These last had to make room for them along the right bank of the Oxus and occupy the country protected by the Indian Caucasus. The Yuet-chi were themselves defeated by the son of the late Wu-sung chieftain. When his father fell in battle he found a secure asylum with the Hiung-nu, who now helped him to regain his lost patrimony. It was in the course of these movements that the Śakas and possibly

* V. A. Smith's *Early History of India*, p. 210 ff.

some of the Hiung-nu moved down the Kabul valley into India, and occupied the country on the right bank of the Indus, right down even to Gujarat. It is one of their out-settlements on the Jumna that the coins and other antiquities of Muttra would seem to warrant.

While all this was taking place across the borders of India, in India itself there was going forward a revolution of no less consequence. The Mauryan empire was overthrown by Pushyamitra Sunga, the Maurya general, in spite of the loyalist minister, a brother-in-law of Yegñasēna Sātakarṇi of the Dakhan. The usurper's strength was tried by a triple war:—(1) against Menander, the ruler of Kabul; (2) against Kāravela, the Kalinga ruler of Orissa; (3) against the loyalist Yegñasēna and in behalf of a counter-claimant to the throne of the kingdom of Vidharba. Though for the time successful against all these, the empire had suffered vital injuries. The Dakhan kingdom or viceroyalty becomes so powerful that the Andhras establish an imperial position themselves, and render their quota of service by holding out against the Śaka invaders from the north-west and west. It must have been in the course of these wars that the occasion should have arisen for the founding of the era which now goes by the name of Vikramāditya, and that under the name of Śaka. As to both these eras and the circumstances of their origin, there is very considerable difference of opinion among scholars. In the course of the political shiftings described above, a clan of the Yueh-chi, by name Kushāna, was able to push its way into India and establish a kingdom in the Punjab including Kāshmīr. The greatest ruler among them, whose empire came into touch

with the Chinese Empire on the one side and the Parthian on the other, is Kanishka, the Constantine of the Buddhism of the greater vehicle (Mahāyānism). Learned scholars associate him with both the eras above referred to, while there are yet others, who would dissociate him from either and refer him to a period later than both. None of them, however, take him beyond the period I have marked at the beginning. At the very beginning of the Christian era then the Punjab and the frontier province, including Kāshmīr, were under the Kushānas or their immediate predecessors or their successors. Gujarat and Mālva, including northern Konkan, were under the Śakas.

During the period marked out above, we have been passing from the supremacy of Buddhism (if such an expression can be regarded as appropriate at all), through a reassertion of the Brahman ascendency, on to a final compromise, ending on the one side in Mahāyānist Buddhism, and on the other in the Hinduism of the *Gita*. For as Professor Kern maintains, on the authority of the Tibetan historian Tāranāth and the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka, the founder of the Mādhyāmika school of Buddhism. Nāgārjuna was a disciple of the Brahman Rāhuḷabhadra who was much indebted to Sage Krishṇa. Paraphrased, this means no less than that these teachers drew a part of their inspiration from the *Gīta*.* This is borne out by the importance which attaches to *Bhakti* (devotion) in Mahāyānist Buddhism and later Hinduism.

During all this period of active mutations both in religion and politics, South India would appear to have

* *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p. 122.

been out of this great vortex. This is a delusion due more to lack of information than to a lack of history. The edicts of Asoka mention the Chōḻa, Pāṇḍya, Kēraḷa, Satīyaputra, and Ceylon, among those with whom he entered into diplomatic relations. He thought it worth his while to send his son and daughter to Ceylon as missionaries. These facts put it beyond a doubt that there was some communication between Magadha and Ceylon, generally by way of the sea. It cannot be that the neighbouring coast was not also brought into touch with the north. The edicts of Asoka, found in the Chitaldroog district, make it certain that there was some connexion, and in all likelihood by way of land, and by the east coast. The Ceylonese tradition, as embodied in the *Mahāvaṁśa*, is quite in support of this conclusion. Between the Mahārāshṭra and Mālva there was a great trunk road notwithstanding the great forest region between them. This road it is that has given us the name Dakshiṇāpatha (Dakhan). Most likely this road wound its way over the hills by way of Burhanpur into westren Mālva. The middle region was the forest, which it continued to be even up to the days of Harsha.

During this period, and for a long time after, Hindustan (the country north of the Vindhyas), kept touch with the outer world by way of land mainly: the south kept itself in contact with the rest of the world chiefly by way of the sea. That the Hindus did not always wait for others to come to them for goods is in evidence in a variety of ways. There is, first, the statement of Cornelius Nepos, who says that Q. Metellus Celer received from the king of

the Suevi some Indians, who had been driven by storm into Germany in the course of a voyage of commerce.* This is quite a precise fact, and is borne out by a number of tales of voyages with the horrors attending navigation depicted in the liveliest colours in certain classes of writings both in Sanskrit and Tamil. Among the places mentioned in the latter classes of sources are those in the East Indian Archipelago, such as Java (Śāvaham), Sambhava (Karpūrasambhavam), Kaṭāha (Sumatra), and Kāḻaham (Burma)† not to mention China. It would thus appear that there was some very considerable activity in maritime commerce. They used to have lighthouses to warn ships and one such is described at the great port at the mouth of the Kāvēri, a big palmyra trunk carrying on the top of it a huge oil-lamp.

On either coast were towns of great commercial importance. Beginning with the coast of the Arabian Sea and passing over the ports beyond the region of South India, the first town of importance is what the classical geographers call Tyndis (Toṇḍi) where Quilandy now stands. Opposite to it lies what was called Liuke (White Island) now going under the name Sacrifice Rock, or 'Veḷḷiyan Kallu' among the people. The Ophir of these geographers is located by some at the site of modern Beypore. South from this was the great mart of Muziris (Muyirikkōḍu, Koḍungalur or Cranganur) the port of Vanji or Karūr, the capital of the Cēras, with the river-mouth Pseudostomos (Aḻimukham or false mouth). This is the port to which navigators turned their course when, through the enterprise of Harpalos, the south-west monsoon was discovered.

* Macrindle, *Ancient India*, p. 110.

† Kāḻaham is now proved to be the same as Kaṭāha (Sans.)

Passing this port we come next to Bakare (Vaikkarai) the port of Nyeacinda in the territory of the Pandion of Madura (Nīrkkunṛam in the kingdom of the Pāṇḍyans at Madura). After this the classical geographers mention only Cape Comorin (Kumāri). Passing Kumāri they lead us into the Argalic (Argali in Tamil, Mahodadi in Sanskrit) gulf, and thence into the port of Kolkoi (Korkai). It is here that the island of Taprabane naturally finds mention. The origin of this name for Ceylon has been the cause of very ingenious speculation. It is regarded by some as the equivalent of Tamraparni (the Tambapanni of the Buddhists). There is another derivation more fanciful than this, namely, *tap Rāvaṇa* as a corruption of dīpa Rāvaṇa. The more likely and much less ingenious origin would be dīp Ruan, Ruan being one of the kingdoms in the Island of Ceylon, about the beginning of the Christian era, according to the *Mahāvamśa*; and that the kingdom to which sailors should inevitably go from the Argalic gulf. Proceeding still further through the gulf these sailors came to the eastern emporium of Toṇḍi, the great mart for Chinese wares, and commodities from the Eastern Archipelago. Further north of this was Puhār at the mouth of the Kāvēri; the next port of importance on this side was Maisolos as Pliny calls it (Masulipatam).*

To take up the political geography of South India as a whole then, the country south of the Krishna was divided among 'the three crowned kings' and seven chieftains, with an eighth coming somewhat later. It is the coast

* Kanakasabhai's *Tamils*, 1800 Years Ago, Ch. iii and Macrindle's *Ancient India* and Ptolemy.

region and the more open country that belonged to the kings, while the middle regions of hills and forests belonged to the chieftains, and perhaps even a few tribes (Nāgas and others). The east coast from near the mouth of the Krishna to the south of Toṇḍi, in the Zamindari of Rāmnād, belonged to the Chōḻa, although midway between the kingdom proper and its northern viceroyalty of Kānchi lay the hill-country round Tirukkōilūr, in the possession of a class of chieftains named Malayamān, very often loyal supporters of their suzerain, occasionally truculent and rebellious. South of the Chōḻa kingdom lay that of the Pāṇḍya, which extended from coast to coast, and embraced within its borders the modern districts of Madura and Tinnevelly, and the State of Travancore, taking in also a part of Coimbatore and Cochin. This included in it the chieftaincies of Āay (the Aioi of Ptolemy) round the Podiyil hill in the Western Ghats, and of Evvi round about the port of Korkai in Tinnevelly. There was besides the domains of Pēhan round the Palnis, which comes under their sphere of influence as well. North of this and along the Western Ghats on the sea-side lay the territory of the Cēra: a territory stretching right across the Palghat gap through Salem and Coimbatore. South Mysore was parcelled out among a number of chieftains corresponding to the modern *Pāḷayagārs*, whose allegiance was at the disposal of either, but the more powerful, of their neighbour kings. Such were the Irungō of Arayam, Pāri of Parambunāḍ, Adiyamān of Tagaḍūr (Dharmapuri) and Ōri of the Kollimalais. The first of these was within Mysore territory proper, and to the east of his domain lay the Gangas, and Kongu to the south.

These chieftaincies were the bone of contention between the Chōḻas and the Cēras. When the period under treatment begins, the Chōḻas are supreme under Karikāla, who ascended the throne. probably after defeating the Cēra and Pāṇḍya in a battle at Veṇṇil (Kōilveṇṇi as it is now called) in the Tanjore district. He was a remarkable sovereign who, in many ways, contributed to the permanent welfare of his subjects and has consequently been handed down to posterity as a beneficent and wise monarch. He constructed the embankments for the Kāvēri, and his chief port Puhār was the great emporium of the east coast. His reign was long and, taken along with those of his two predecessors and the successor next following him, constitutes the period of the first Chōḻa ascendency in the south. In the reign of his successor a great catastrophe befell Puhār, and the city and port were both destroyed. This was a hard blow to the ascendency of the Chōḻas. But Karikāla had, after defeating his contemporary Cēra, given one of his daughters in marriage to the son of his vanquished rival. This alliance stood the Chōḻas in good stead. Karikāla's successor began his reign with a victory, which his heir-apparent won for him, against the Cēra and Pāṇḍya combined, at Kāriyār, probably in the Salem district.* When Puhār was destroyed there was a civil war, owing perhaps to the untimely death of the young Chōḻa prince; and the Cēra ruler for the time being, advanced through the central region. He intervened in favour of his cousins with effect, as against the rival claimants of royal blood, and restored the Chōḻa dynasty to

* In the region round Kāḻahasti in the Chingleput Dt.

some power ; but the ascendency surely enough passed from them to the Cēra. The Cēra ascendency under the Red-Cēra (Śeṅguṭṭuvan) lasted only one generation ; in the reign of his successor the Pāṇḍyas rose to greater importance and the Cēra suffered defeat and imprisonment at his hands. This Pāṇḍya ascendency probably lasted on somewhat longer till about the rise of the Pallavas in Kānchi. This course of the political centre of gravity of power in Southern India is borne out in very important particulars by the Ceylon chronicle called the *Mahāvamśa*. According to this work, the Chōḻas were naturally the greatest enemies of the Sinhalese rulers. There were usurpers from the Chōḻa country in Ceylon in the first century B.C; and there were invasions and counter-invasions as well. On one occasion the Chōḻa invaders carried away 12,000 inhabitants of Ceylon and set them to work at 'the Kāvēri' as the Chronicle has it.* This looks very much like an exploit of Karikāla, seeing that it was he who built the city of Puhār. King Gajabāhu of Ceylon was present at the invitation of Red-Cēra, to witness the celebration of a sacrifice and the consecration of the temple to the 'Chaste Lady' (Pattinī-dēvi) at Vanji, on the west coast.

The ascendency of the Cēra, however, passed away, as already mentioned, to the Pāṇḍyas in the course of one single generation. The Red-Cēra was succeeded by his son, 'the Cēra of the elephant look', who was his father's viceroy at Toṇḍi, and figured prominently in the wars of his predecessor in the middle region. He was defeated and taken prisoner in a battle, which he had to fight with the contemporary Pāṇḍyan, designated the victory, at

* Upham's *Mahāvamśa*, Vol. i, p. 228.

Talaiyālangānam. With this mishap to the ruler the Cēra ascendency passes away. The Pāṇḍyas of Madura take their turn now, and continued to hold the position of hegemony up to the time that the Pallavas rise into importance. This, in brief and in very general terms, was the political history of South India at the beginning and during the early centuries of the Christian Era.

Passing on from the political to the industrial condition of India, we have already described the principal sea-ports, both on the western and eastern seaboard. If, as has been pointed out, there were so many thriving ports and, if foreign merchants sought these for trade at considerable risk of pirates and, if there was so much enterprsie in sea-going among the inhabitants of the country, the conclusion is irresistible that the country had prosperous industry, and so, on examination, it appears certainly to have been. Apart from the complaints of Petronius that fashionable Roman ladies exposed their charms much too immodestly by clothing themselves in the 'webs of woven wind', as he called the muslins imported from India, Pliny says that India drained the Roman Empire annually to the extent of 55,000,000 sesterces, equal to £ 486,979 * sending in return goods which sold at a hundred times their value in India.† He also remarks in another place, 'this is the price we pay for our luxuries and women.'

That the industrial arts had received attention and cultivation in early times in India is in evidence to the

* Mommsen gives the total £ 11,000,000, £ 6,000,000 for Arabia, £ 5,000,000 for India.

† *Malabar Manual.* Vol. i, pp. 250-1.

satisfaction of the most sceptical mind. The early Tamils divided arts into six groups: ploughing (meaning thereby agriculture), handicrafts, painting, commerce and trade, the learned arts, and lastly the fine arts. Of these agriculture and commerce were regarded as of the first importance. Flourishing trade presupposes a volume of industry, the principal of which was weaving then, as it also has been until recently. Cotton, silk and wool seem to have been the materials that were wrought into cloths. Among the woollens we find mention of manufactures from "the wool of rats", which was regarded as particularly warm. There are thirty varieties of silks mentioned, each with a distinctive appellation of its own, as distinguished from the imported silks of China which had a separate name. The character of the cotton stuffs that were manufactured is indicated by the comparisons instituted between them and, 'sloughs of serpents' or 'vapour from milk'; and the general description of these as 'those fine textures the thread of which could not be followed even by the eye.'

The chief exports from the country, as the author of the *Periplus* says, were these: 'The produce of the soil like pepper, great quantities of best pearl are likewise purchased here, ivory, silk in the web, spikenard from the Ganges, betel from the countries further to the east, transparent stones of all sorts, diamonds, rubies and tortoise shell from the golden Chersonese or from the islands off the coast of Limurike'. This is all from the port of Muziris on the west coast. He goes on to say: "There is a great resort of shipping to this port for pepper and betel; the merchants bring out a large quantity of spice, and their

other imports are topazes, stibium, coral, flint, glass, brass, and lead, a small quantity of wine as profitable as at Barugaza, cinnabar, fine cloth, arsenic and wheat, not for sale but for the use of the crew'. That Pliny's complaint about the drain was neither imaginary nor hypersensitive is in evidence in a passage descriptive of Muziris in one of the ancient classics of Tamil literature* : 'Muśiri to which come the well-rigged ships of the Yavanas, bringing gold and taking away spices in exchange'.

Regarding the trade of the east coast, here follows a description of Puhār as a port ; 'Horses were brought from distant lands beyond the seas, pepper was brought in ships ; gold and precious stones came from the northern mountains ; sandal and *aghil* came from the mountains towards the west ; pearl from the southern seas and coral from the eastern seas. The produce of the region watered by the Ganges ; all that is grown on the banks of the Kāvēri ; articles of food from Īḻam (Ceylon) and the manufactures of Kāḻaham (Burma) ' † were brought there for sale. The products of particular importance received in the port of Toṇḍi are *aghil* (a kind of black aromatic wood), fine silk stuff (from China), candy, sandal, scents, and camphor. All of these articles and salt were carried into the interior by means of wagons drawn by teams of oxen, slowly trudging along through town and village, effecting exchanges with commodities for export. Tolls were paid on the way, and the journey from the coast up the plateau and

---

* *Ahanānūru*, poem 149.

† *Paṭṭinappālai*, ll. 127 ff. and *The Tamils 1800 Years Ago*, p. 27. Kāḻaham is now identified with Kaṭāha or Kaḍāram, Kēḍala in the Malaya Peninsula.

back again occupied many months. A brisk and thriving commerce with the corresponding volume of internal trade argues peace, and the period to which the above description will apply must have been a period of general peace in the Peninsula. They did not forget in those days to maintain a regular customs establishment, the officials of which piled up the grain and stored up the things that could not immediately be measured and appraised, leaving them in the dockyards carefully sealed with the tiger signet of the king.*

The Tamils built their own ships; and in the other crafts of the skilled artisan they seem to have attained some proficiency, though they availed themselves of experts from distant places. In the building of the royal palace at Puhār, skilled artisans from Magadha, mechanics from Marāḍam (Mahratta), smiths from Avanti (Mālva), carpenters from Yavana, worked† together with the artisans of the Tamil land. There is mention of a temple of the most beautiful workmanship, in the same city, built by the Gurjjaras.‡ In the building of forts and in the providing of them with weapons and missiles, both for offence and defence, the Tamils had attained to something like perfection. Twenty-four such weapons are mentioned among the defences of Madura.

Passing on from the industrial to the literary, social and religious condition of the south, which we have so far been considering, we have again to do with the three kingdoms, each with a capital city and a premier port. The

* *Paṭṭinappālai*, ll. 134–6.
† *Maṇimēkhalai*, Canto xix, ll. 107 and ff.
‡ Ibid, Canto xviii, l. 145.

Chōḻas had their capital at Uṛaiyūr, with Puhār for an alternative capital and chief port; the Pāṇḍyas had their capital at Madura, with the port and premier viceroyalty at Korkai; the Cēras had their capital at Vanji, with the principal port and viceroyalty at Toṇḍi. The Chōḻas had their premier viceroy, who was generally the heir-apparent or at least a prince of the blood, at Kānchi. These towns and ports, therefore, bulk very largely in the literature and literary traditions of the period. The road from Kānchi to Trichinopoly appears to have passed through Tirukkōilūr. From Trichinopoly (i. e. Uṛaiyūr) to Madura it lay along the more arid parts of the Tanjore district to Koḍumbai (now Koḍumbālūr) in the state of Pudukōṭṭa, and thence to Neḍunguḷam; from which place the road broke into three, and led up to Madura in three branches. From this last town a road kept close to the banks of the river Vaigai up to the Ghats; and from there it went up the hills and down again along the banks of the Periyār to the town of Vanji, situated near its mouth. There were also other roads besides; one, at least, from Vanji to the modern Karūr, and thence on to Tirukkōilūr. These roads were not safe in all parts alike, there being certain portions of them which passed through desert regions, inhabited by wild tribes, who were a cause of terror to the wayfarers, particularly those who had something to lose, notwithstanding the fact that robbery was punished with nothing short of impalement. Journeys were none the less frequent for purposes of pilgrimage, or in search of patronage for learning, or for the profits of commerce.

The rulers in those days held before them high ideals of government. Their absolute authority was limited

by the 'five great assemblies', as they were called, of ministers, priests, generals, heralds (spies), and ambassadors. There appears to have been a general permit for a learned Brahmin to speak his mind in any durbar; and these often gave out their opinions most fearlessly. This privilege was similarly accorded also to men of learning. I give a few instances in illustration: a Brahman pilgrim from the Chōḻa country happened to be present at the Cēra court, when the Cēra king gave orders to his ministers to set his army in motion to avenge an insult that some northern princes, he was told, had given him. The minister's remonstrance and the reluctance of the general were overruled. This Brahman got up and pointed out, in a speech, that he had warred for the fifty years of his rule in order to safeguard his earthly interests; but had done very little to provide for himself in the life to come. Of course the expedition was countermanded, and the king began to make provision for the future. A young Pāṇḍya king of the next generation showed himself too enthusiastic for war, and it fell to the lot of one of the poets at court to wean him of this war-craze. In a poem of 850 lines he conveyed the hint to the king; if language can be conceived to be the art of concealing thought, here is an instance *par excellence*. The next instance takes us to the court of the Malayamān of Tirukkōilūr, who neglected his wife. A number of poets of the first rank interceded and restored him to her. The next case that I will mention here is that of a poet, who enjoyed the patronage of successive Chōḻa rulers. He found that at the end of a civil war the victorious Chōḻa was about to put to death his vanquished cousin. The poet pointed out that the victory tranished the good

name of the Chōḻas, quite as much as a defeat; and that he did not know whether to rejoice for the victorious Chōḻa or weep for the vanquished one. The intercession was certainly effective. These illustrations show in addition the respect that learning commanded. I shall permit myself one more illustration to show this respect. The warlike Pāṇḍya referred to already, came to the throne young. He had immediately to go to war against a combination of his two neighbours, and his court was naturally anxious as to the result. The young prince in a poem, full of poetical grace, assured them that he would return victorious, and that, if he should fail, the poets of his court, including Māngudi Marudan, might cease to attend.

The ideal of justice set before them in those days was something unattainable. They strove their utmost to attain to the sublimity of their ideal; and a king was judged good or bad upon the degree of success he achieved in this particular branch of his duties. 'Oh the king! he is to blame if the rains fail; he is to blame if women go astray. What is there in a king's estate, except perpetual anxiety, that people should envy the position of a king for!' Learning went in search of patronage. There must have been a very considerable output of literature. It was doubtless to check the growth of the weed of learning that a body of censors called the Śaṅgam was instituted. It is a number of works, which received the imprimatur of this learned body, that has been the source of all this information regarding this period. This is not the place to enter into the question of the origin of Tamil Literature; or of its independence or otherwise; or of its connexion with the literature of

Sanskrit. But I may romark, in passing, that Tamil Literature (as distinct from language,) cannot lay claim to that independence that its votaries demand for it with more zeal than argument. Learning was somewhat widespread and much sought after. Woman had their share of learning, as the number of women poets indicates. Nor was this learning confined to the Brahman ; although he was the sole custodian of the ‘ northern lore ”.

In matters religious there was a happy confusion. Jains, Buddhists, Brahmans, Śaivas, Vaishṇavas, and people of other persuasions, both major and minor, all lived together and at peace with one another. ‘There were splendid temples in the city dedicated to the worship of the celestial tree Kalpaka, the celestial elephant Airāvata, Vajrāyudha (the thunderbolt of Indra), Baladēva, Sūrya, Chandra, Śiva, Subrahmaṇya, Sātavāhana, of Nigrantha, Kāma (god of love), and Yama (god of death). There were seven *vihārās* reputed to have been built by Indra, the king of the gods in which dwelt no less than 300 monks (Buddhistic). The temple of Yama was outside the walls of the town, in the burial ground in the city of Puhār, the capital of the Chōḻas.'* The three rival systems of the Brahmans, and those of the Jains and the Buddhists flourished together, each with its own clientele unhampered by the others in the prosecution of its own holy rights. The Brahman was regarded as an inconvenience, by some, but the general feeling was that he was indispensable to the prosperity of the State. A devout Buddhist and an ascetic Jain prince both speak of him with great respect. He was

* ***Pattinappālai*** etc.

the custodian of the hidden lore; he was the guardian of the sacred fire, the source of material prosperity to the State; he was the person who performed the sacrifices according to the difficult orthodox rites, and thus brought timely rain. These are the terms in which these heterodox writers refer to him. He had a function in society and he discharged it faithfully. The whole attitude both of the orthodox and also of the heterodox in matters of religion was pity for the ignorance of the other; but nothing more bitter, as Max Muller has very well pointed out.

Animism seems to have played an important part in the religious system of those days. There was a temple consecrated to the 'Chaste Lady', as she was called, who died in consequence of the murder of her husband. Her images are preserved in temples up to the present times, for, according to Dr. A. K. Kumarasami,* some of the images depicted in illustration of the ancient art of Ceylon are of this deified woman. Sati was in vogue; but under well recognized limitations. This was permitted only to women, who had neither natural guardians to fall back upon, nor children to bring up. That it was not uncommon for young women to return to their parents widowed, is vouched for by a comparison that a poet institutes between the approach of darkness and the return of the widowed young woman, whose husband had lately fallen in war. Annual festivals were celebrated with great eclat, and one of the grandest was that to Indra celebrated at Puhār.

I have gathered my facts from a vast body of Tamil Literature only recently made available to the student. I

* *J. R. A. S.*, 1909, p. 292.

now proceed to consider the sources of this information, which are the classical writers; Indian literature, Tamil and Sanskrit; and the Ceylonese chronicle. Of the first group, Strabo wrote in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, Pliny published his geography in A.D. 77; the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* was written in the first century A.D.; Ptolemy wrote his geography about A.D. 150; the *Peutingerian Tables* were composed in A.D. 222. There were other writers who wrote later, but we are not concerned with them directly. I would draw attention to three points, taken from the works of classical writers.

Pliny remarks: 'At the present day voyages are made to India every year, and companies of archers are carried on board, because the Indian seas are infested by pirates'. Later on he says: 'It (Muziris) is not a desirable place of call, pirates being in the neighbourhood, who occupy a place called Nitrias; and besides, it is not well supplied with wares for traffic'. This was before 77 A.D. Ptolemy regarded this port Muziris as an emporium, and places the country of Aioi south of Bakarai. The *Peutingerian Tables* state clearly that two Roman cohorts were maintained in the same town for the protection of Roman commerce.

Mr. Sewell, who has made an elaborate study of the Roman coins found in India, considers that the coin finds lead to the following conclusions *:—

1. There was hardly any commerce between Rome and India during the Consulate.

* *J. R. A. S.*, 1904, p. 591.

2. With Augustus began an intercourse which, enabling the Romans to obtain oriental luxuries during the early days of the empire, culminated about the time of Nero, who died 68 A.D.

3. From this time forward the trade declined till the date of Caracalla, A.D. 217.

4. From the date of Caracalla it almost entirely ceased.

5. It revived again, though slightly, under the Byzantine emperors.

He also infers that the trade under the early emperors was in luxuries; under the later ones in industrial products, and under the Byzantines the commerce was with the south-west coast only, and not with the interior. He differs from those who find an explanation of the fluctuation in the political and social condition of India itself, and the facilities or their absence for navigating the seas; and considers that the cause is to be sought for in the political and social condition of Rome.

From an examination of the second class of my sources of information alone, we find that there was a period when South India was under great rulers, who gave the country peace and thus provided the indispensable security for commerce. This period can be shown to correspond to that of the Roman empire from Augustus to Caracalla. After this period, we find the country in a condition of political flux. These being so we may still find one, at least, of the most potent causes of this commercial decline in the

internal condition of India itself. Pliny and Ptolemy do not mention the Roman cohorts at Muziris which the *Peutingerian Tables* do. The first exploit of the Red Cēra is the destruction of the Kaḍambu tree on the sea coast. Another compliment that the poets never miss an opportunity of bestowing upon this patron is that the Cēra fleet sailed on the waters of that littoral with a sense of dominion and security. The Kaḍambu mentioned above is explained as a tree of extraordinary power which could not be cut down by ordinary man. I rather think from the context that it has reference to a piratical rendezvous. If this view be correct, the advent of the said Cēra brought along with it security. This would be in conformity with Ptolemy's reference to Āay, who was one of the seven chieftains known to literature as 'the last seven patrons'. From the body of works known to Tamil scholars as Śaṅgam works their contemporaneity could easily be established. I have examined this question elsewhere in the chapter on *The Augustan Age of Tamil Literature* and find the name Āay a distinctive name of an individual, and not that of a family. Then Āay must have been the contemporary of. or a little older than, Ptolemy, and the age of the Red Cēra, and the Cēra ascendency. This conclusion only confirms what has been arrived at independently of this class of evidence. Gajabāhu of Ceylon, who visited the Red Cēra almost at the end of his reign, ruled according to the Ceylonese Chronicle from A.D. 113 to 135. Allowing for the difference between the Ceylonese date of the Nirvāṇa of the Buddha and that arrived at by modern scholars, as Dr. Fleet, namely, sixty years, the date for Gajabāhu would be A.D. 173 to 193. The Cēra

ascendency then would cover the latter two-thirds of the second century A.D. Here has to be brought in the Paiśāchi work *Brihat Kathā*. Among the temples mentioned as having been found at Puhār was one dedicated to Śātavāhana. This personage was the ruler in whose court flourished the minister Gunāḍya, who was the author of this stupendous work which stands at the root of all romantic literature in India, whether in Sanskrit or any vernacular. It was a translation of this work that set the fashion in Tamil for the composition of the romantic epics. The age of the original is still matter under investigation. The latest authority on the question is the Dutch scholar Speyer, who would place it in the third century A.D. at the earliest—a date clearly impossible according to our line of inquiry. I shall not say more about it here now; but only remark that one of the works, clearly based upon this, has to be referred to a period anterior to the astronomer, Varāhamihira A.D. 533. This work, *Maṇimēkhala* refers to the asterism under which the Buddha was born as the fourteenth; which, according to the modern computation, following Varāhamihira, ought to be the seventeenth. The *Ceylon Chronicle* also deserves to be investigated more carefully. So far investigations from different points of view only appear to confirm its chronology, except for the correction made above.

The date of the death of Caracalla corresponds closely to the disappearance of the Śātavāhanas of the Dakhan. According to the latest opinion the power of the Kushānas also vanished about the same period. In South India likewise the Pāṇḍya ascendency passes into darkness.

The century following is one of the dark spots in Indian history, until the rise of the Guptas in the north, of the Chāḷukyas in the Dakhan, and of the Pallavas in the south. More research into Tamil literature and the Ceylon *Mahāvaṃśa* would yield results worth the trouble, failing coins and other auxiliaries. There may be also something to be gained by a careful study of the traditions that grew up later on.

[*Lecture to the Mythic Society.—Reprinted from the Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Vol. IV, No. 4.*]

The Mahavamsa and South Indian History.

I

The publication of a corrected text of this Pāḷi work and a revised translation by Professor Geiger mark an important step in the direction of the investigation into the historical value of this chronicle so far as it bears on the history of South India. That Professor Hultzsch should have carried on this investigation some way in the pages of the *Journal of the Asiatic Society* for July of last year indicates the attention that this question is likely to receive, though the learned Professor confines himself to the period of South Indian history covered by lithic records in the publication of which he has done the best work so far for this part of the country. There is, however, another part of that history which requires as much investigation, nay even more, as it remains comparatively unexplored. Notwithstanding the translations already available, the facilities for the study of this question did not exist for pursuing definite lines of enquiry till now. Professor Geiger's translation and the researches of Dr. Fleet and a few others make the study possible.

Professor Geiger's translation carries the work just to the point at which light from inscriptions becomes available. It is particularly of this part and of its historical value, that there has been the greatest divergence of

opinion. A careful and scholarly investigation into this period was wanted and has now become possible. Before we proceed to set forth the information available, a brief resume of the results of Professor Geiger's study will be of value to those who may not be able to make the study for themselves; the more so, as some important questions bearing on the literature and history of the Tamils depend upon the historical value of these chronicles of Ceylon.

Leaving aside the literary questions connected with the *Mahāvamśa* for the time, the sources from which the Chronicle drew its material can be traced by means of the *Vamśaṭṭappakāśinī* a native commentary on the Chronicle by an unknown author. Dr. Fleet's researches leave little doubt as to the *Mahāvamśa* being a '*dīpika*' or commentary on the *Dīpavamśa*; and this would warrant the inference that the *Mahāvamśa* of the ancients in the introduction is no other than the *Dīpavamśa* itself. At the time of the composition of the earlier of these, the *Dīpavamśa* at the close of the fourth century A.D., there existed in Ceylon a sort of chronicle embodying the history of the island from its legendary beginnings onwards. This old chronicle constituted part of the *Aṭṭakathā*, i.e. the old Commentary-literature on the canonical writings of the Buddhists which Buddhaghōṣa took as a basis for his illuminating works. It was like the *Aṭṭakathā*, composed in old Sinhalese prose, probably mingled with verse in the Pāḷi language.

This *Aṭṭakathā-Mahāvamśa* existed, as did the *Aṭṭakathā* itself generally, in various recensions in different monasteries of the island. The divergences among these recensions were slight. That at the Mahāvihāra monastery

at Anurādhāpura was of particular importance as it is from this recension that the auther of the *Mahāvamśa Ṭika* drew for his meterial.

The Chronicle must originally have come down only to the arrival of Mahinda in Ceylon, but was continued later in all probability down to the reign of Mahāsēna (beginning of the fourth century A.D.) with whose reign both the *Mahāvamśa* and the *Dīpavamśa* come to an end.

The *Dīpavamśa* presents the first clumsy redaction in Pāḷi verse. The *Mahāvamśa*, on the contrary, is a new treatment of the same material distinguished by greater skill in the use of the Pāḷi language, by more artistic composition, and by a more liberal use of the material contained in the original work. The author of this is known by the name Mahānāman.

Buddhaghōṣa bases his historical introduction to the *Samantapāsādhika* on the *Dīpavamśa*; but he completes and amplifies the information therein available, by recourse to the only other source, the *Aṭṭakathā* itself.

The *Mahāvamśa Ṭika* brings to the contents of the *Dīpavamśa* and the *Mahāvamśa* further additions from the same original source. This last was not composed till the period A.D. 1000 to 1250. This *Ṭīka* leaves no doubt that the author had the *Aṭṭakathā* before him and also supposes it to be known to his readers and accessible to all.

Thus it is clear that all these works had, practically, the same source of information and were composed at difierent periods by different authors in the following order: *Dīpavamśa* (fourth century) *Samantapāsādhika* (fifth

century), *Mahāvaṃśa* (sixth century) and the *Ṭīka* (in the eleventh or twelfth century).

In regard to the trustworthiness of these chronicles Professor Geiger is pitted against R. O. Franke, Kern, and V. A. Smith. H. C. Norman to a qualified extent, and Rhys Davids are in support. The Professor follows Windisch in regard to the interpretation of the Buddhistic tradition, and would not have us pour away the child with the bath, but would begin by removing the mythical additions. We need by no means however, take the residue as current coin. Here we are concerned to examine how far the tradition is established as trustworthy, by internal or external evidence, and how far shaken as being untrustworthy.

If we pause first at internal evidence then the Ceylonese Chronicles will assuredly at once win approval in that they at least wished to write the truth, Certainly the writers could not go beyond the ideas determined by their age and their social position and beheld the events of a past time in the mirror of a one-sided tradition. But they certainly did not intend to deceive their hearers or readers. This is clear from the remarkably objective standpoint from which they judge even the mortal foes of the Aryan race. That certainly deserves to be emphasized. It is true not only of dominating personalities (such as, to all appearance, Eḷāra was), but also of the two usurpers Sēna and Guṭṭika of whom it is said : (*Dīp.* 11.47 and *Mah.* 21.11) *rajjam dhammena kārayum* (ruled the kingdom with justice).

'Besides, the obvious endeavour to make out a systematic chronology is such as to inspire confidence at the outset.

Indeed whole sections of the *Dīpavaṁśa* consist entirely of synchronistic connexions of the ecclesiastical tradition with profane history and of the history of India with that of Ceylon.' This, in the Professor's own words, is his opinion of the historical value of the Chronicles from internal evidence.

More important is the external testimony which supports the Ceylon tradition. In regard to the list of Indian kings the Ceylon tradition finds support in Brahman tradition concerning those before Asoka. Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru are contemporaries of Buddha according to the canonical tradition, and Brahman traditions agree in regard to the two names; the Nandas, Chandragupta, and Bindusāra are undoubted historical personages and in regard to them the traditions agree closely. Chandragupta's Brahman counsellor Chāṇakya is known to the Choronicles. It is only in regard to the length of the reigns of Bindusāra and Asoka that there is slight difference. In so far as this period of Indian History is concerned the Ceylon tradition finds support in the Hindu *Purāṇas* though Jain tradition does not agree quite so well.

The *Dīpavaṁśa*, the *Mahāvaṁśa* and the tradition of the country itself are unanimous that the conversion of Ceylon was the work of two of Asoka's children, his son Mahinda and his daughter Sangamitta. The fact of the conversion of the island does not find mention in the two Rock Edicts of Asoka which mention the island namely, Edict XIII which includes the island among those to which Asoka despatched missionaries, and in Edict II among those in which he provides for the distribution of medicines.

These are of the thirteenth year of his reign, while the conversion of the island is put down to the eighteenth year in the Ceylonese tradition. Such an omission casts a doubt upon the authenticity of the tradition which, according to V. A. Smith, is heightened by the suspicious look of the name Sangamitta.

There is nothing unusual about the canonical name superseding the lay, and this seems even to have been the fashion in later inscriptional times, as the name of the several queens, nay, even those of the Chōḻa rulers would go to prove. There is nothing to warrant our expectation that Asoka should mention these names in any of his edicts. The two already referred to are earlier than the date of conversion of the island and the only other where we can expect such reference is according to Fleet of date A.B. 256 twenty years later than the event which makes the reason for mention not sufficiently compelling. In any case we are on too uncertain grounds to draw definite conclusions from this omission.

The mention of Ceylon in the earlier edicts, if the name Tambapanni is to be taken as referring to the island and not the ccast opposite, can only warrant the inference that before Mahinda relations existed between continental India and Ceylon, and that efforts were made to transplant Buddhist doctrine to Ceylon. This inference finds support in the *Mahāvamśa* and the *Dīpavamśa* which relate that 'Asoka, sending to Devānāmpiyatissa presents for his second consecration as king, exhorted him to adhere to the doctrine of the Buddha.'

The history of the missions as related in these chronicles finds confirmation in important particulars in the inscriptions in the Bhilsa Topes. There is architectural evidence of an unimpeachable character in the same monuments regarding the transplantation of the branch of the sacred Bodhi-tree from Uruvela to Ceylon.

There is thus a very strong body of evidence to support the assumption that the Chronicles do attempt to give what their authors accepted as a true narration of events mixed up, of course, with all that their pious fancies depicted as the necessary accompaniments of the successful adoption of the true doctrine. If so much is warranted in regard to the events narrated, the next important enquiry would naturally be the value of the chronology of the Chronicles.

II

The objective confirmation of the Chronicles detailed already proves at least that the statements made in the Chronicle are not altogether untenable and are worthy of being tested. They are not to be accepted as infallible, and the longer the interval between the time of the events and that of the narration the greater is the possibility of error and the more will the influence of legend be noticeable.

This general position applies with particular force for the oldest period extending from the landing of Vijaya to the accession of the sixth in succession from him, Devānampiyatissa. The first fact that casts suspicion is that the date of Vijaya's arrival is said to have been the date of the Buddha's death. All the reigns are given a round number

of years for their duration ; and there is a positive impossibility in regard to the reigns of the last two : Pāṇḍukābhaya and Muṭaśiva. The former ascended the throne at thirty-seven and had a reign of seventy years. This would give him 107 years of life. His successor was born of a marriage before he ascended the throne, and must have been past the prime of manhood when the father died. Yet his successor is credited with the long reign of sixty years. The only explanation possible for this is that the chronology was made to fit a scheme for making the arrival of Vijaya coincide with the Nirvāṇa of the Buddha which coincidence somehow got to be believed in at the time. There would then be an error of about seventy or eighty years. This error need not invalidate the tradition, however, as the account of Pāṇḍukābhya's campaigns gives one a decisive impression of trustworthiness. Even for the period following there are clear evidences of gaps filled up in this manner, as for instance, the reigns of the following six rulers, of whom four are sons of the last with two usurpers between, occupy a span of ninety-two years. When we come to the reign of Duṭṭagāmaṇi, the chronology becomes credible, the numbers appear less artificial and more trustworthy. Even in the period of doubtful chronology the reign of Devānāmpiyatissa and the arrival of Mahinda stand out clear from the wavering traditions of the times before and after.

The starting point of the chronological tradition recorded in the monkish Chronicles of Ceylon is the year of the Buddha's death. For this tradition events and historical characters are of importance only in so far as they were

of importance for the development of the Buddhist community. There are isolated occurrences and personalities connected, even in early times, with a certain date which announced the time that had passed since the Buddha's death. There would naturally be gaps between, and fictions would be made filling up and completing the tradition. This was probably the manner in which the chronological system of Ceylon was built up, taken over in all probability from the *Aṭṭakathā*.

One of the fixed dates established at a specially early period which forms the corner stone of the whole system is the number 218 for the coronation of Asoka. This event is said to have taken place four years after the actual succession of Asoka and this would bring this last event to 214 years after the Nirvāṇa. Subtracting from this twenty-eight years for Bindusāra, the father, and twenty-four for Chandragupta the grandfather of Asoka, Chandragupta's accession would have taken place 162 years after the Nirvāṇa. His accession is now generally ascribed to the year 321 B.C. The year of the Nirvāṇa would thus be 321 + 162 or 483 B.C. Admitting the hypothetical character of the two dates, it must still be said that the year 218 for the coronation of Asoka is one which deserves to be the least suspected, as there is nothing impossible or even improbable in regard to the preservation of a definite tradition over the comparatively short period of time. In regard to the date of Chandragupta's accession a little shifting backward or forward may be necessary but the error is likely to be just a few years. In regard to the duration of the two reigns, the twenty-four years for Chandragupta

may be taken as quite certain as in this particular the northern and southern traditions are in agreement, while the difference of three years may have to be allowed one way or the other for his son. Nevertheless there seems to be a tendency to unanimity in regard to the much disputed date of the Buddha's death as stated above.

It is needless to discuss here all the alternative dates offered for the same event except that of the chronology current in Ceylon, Burma and Siam, namely, the year 544 B.C., for the Nirvāṇa. That this date is wrong and contains an error of about sixty years is now generally admitted. Nor is it based on a continuous tradition as has already been pointed out by Fleet. It is a relatively late fabrication and has to be referred to the eleventh century A.D. As a matter of fact indications are to be found that, in earlier times, and indeed, down to the beginning of the eleventh century A.D. an era persisted even in Ceylon which was reckoned from 483 B.C. as the year of the Buddha's death. From the middle of the eleventh century the new era took its rise being reckoned from the year 544 B.C., and is still in use.

In discussing this question King Parākramabāhu and his predecessors up to Udaya III 1507 A.B. will have to be dated. That Parākramabāhu was crowned when 1696 years had elapsed after the Buddha's death (*i.e.* in the year 1697 A.B.) is derivable from inscriptions, confirmed and completed by literary data. Eight years later (*i.e.* in the year 1705 A.B.) a second coronation apparently took place. In the fourth year afterwards when 1708 years had gone by since the Nirvāṇa (that is in the year 1709 A.B.) he held

a Buddhist Synod. According to the Ceylonese era these are the years A.D. 1153, and 1161, and 1165. This period for Parākrama is supported by an entirely independent source, namely, a South Indian inscription at the temple of Tiruvāliśvara at Ārpākkam. Thus for the second half of the twelfth century A.D., the existence of the Ceylon era beginning from 544 B.C. is established with certainty.

According to the *Cūḷavaṃśa*, the six predecessors of Parākramabāhu from Parākrama Pāṇḍu (121 in Wijesimha's list) reigned 107 years. The accession of the last named will thus fall in 1590 A. B. or according to the Ceylon era A. D. 1046. This date is confirmed by the South Indian Maṇimangalam inscription of the same date, according to which Parākrama Pāṇḍu was conquered and killed in this year by the Chōḷa King Rājādhirāja I. The reign of two years given to him in the *Cūḷavaṃśa* may be explained by the possibility of the reign having been counted from one Indian year in which he began to reign and the next in which he met his death, both falling within the one year A.D. 1046. This would prove that the Ceylon era existed in the middle of the eleventh century A.D.

Passing on to Udaya III (111 in Wijesimha's list), there is a South Indian inscription which fixes for him a date which throws quite a new light on the whole reckoning of eras. According to the *Cūḷavaṃśa* the interval between the accession of Udaya and that of Parākrama Pāṇḍu is ninety-three years and eight days. We have seen above that the latter ascended the throne in A.B. 1590 or A.D. 1046. We have consequently for the accession of Udaya III the date A.B. 1497 or A.D. 953. But according

to a Tanjore inscription of Rājēndra Chōḷadēva, Udaya's accession must be dated about the year A.D. 1015.

This inscription gives an account of a military expedition to Ceylon and corresponds as to its details with one which, according to the *Cūḷavsmśa* (53·40 foll), occurred under Udaya at the beginning of his reign. According to Kielhorn's calculations the Chōḷa's accession must have taken place between the end of 1011 and the middle of 1012. The expedition falls between the fourth and sixth year of the reign, i.e. between A.D. 1015 and 1018. The years A.B. 1497 and 1498 must fall within this period. Taking the first years in each case, we get the date for the death of the Buddha the year 483 B.C. (1497 – 1015 or 482 years complete ; hence 483 B C.)

So with Wikramsinghe we must state the matter thus. The author of that part of the *Cūḷavamśa* which deals with the kings from Udaya III to Parākramabāhu I lived at a time when the present era, reckoned from 544 B.C. was in use. He was acquainted with three well-established dates, A.B. 1497, 1590, 1693 for the accession of Udaya III, Parākrama Pāṇḍu and Parākramabāhu I. But he did not know that the first of the three dates was based on quite a different era, reckoned from 483 B.C. The interval between Udaya III and Parākrama Pāṇḍu amounted, in his view, to ninety-three years but was in reality only thirty-one years (A.D. 1042–1051)

Considering the detail in which the events of this period are described in the *Cūḷauamśa* it is difficult to decide at what particular point the excess of sixty-two years should be struck out. The principal part of the

excess Professor Geiger would strike out of the reign of Mahinda V and the interregnum that followed (115 and 116 of Wijesimha's list) both together taking a period of forty-eight years.

Thus then, it is clear that all parts of the Ceylon Chronicle are not necessarily unreliable, nor is the chronology even of the earlier portions so faulty as to make the rejection of the chronicles imperative from the point of view of history. Professor Geiger's other interesting disquisitions are indeed valuable in themselves, but are not material to the question of any South Indian synchronisms that may be discussed in the following pages.

III

Having examined as a preliminary study, the historical value of the Chronicle, it becomes necessary to consider in what manner the Chronicle comes into touch with South Indian History and tradition. While for Ceylon it is the Chronicle that supplies the information, it has for South India to be Tamil literature, as inscriptions of a date before that of King Mahāsēna (A.D. 325–352) are very rare indeed in this part of the country. The evidence of literature may not be so precise, nor perhaps of the same value, as that of the inscriptions. None the less they are of value and the more so where they are the only available evidence. Their value cannot be precisely appraised on the whole but in each instance it may be capable of being ascertained, if sufficient care be taken.

The first reference in the Chronicle that calls for attention is the name Nāgadīpa given to a part of the

Island of Ceylon. The Island as a whole is said to have been inhabited by the people called Nāgas. There is further on page 6 of Professor Geiger's translation reference to the jewelled throne about which two Nāgas, uncle and nephew, went to war. At the intercession of the Buddha they composed their quarrel and made a joint present of it to the Buddha himself. This is the account of the Buddha throne of miraculous power referred to in the *Maṇimēkhalai* (Canto VIII, ll. 1155–63) almost in the same terms.

The next reference which finds mention in both the Chronicle and the *Kāvya* is the Buddha footprint on Adam's Peak. According to the former the Buddha having accepted the hospitality of Maṇiyakkika, ruler of Kalyāṇi (in the South-West of the Island), left his footprints on Samantakūṭa. These footprints and their miraculous efficacy are both detailed in Canto 11, ll. 20-25 of the work above adverted to (Geiger Trans., p. 8.).

The next for which so far no actual reference on this side of the sea is available, is the statement that Vijaya and his companions who settled on the island found spouses in Madura. As a result of a mission in this behalf one thousand families of the eighteen guilds, landed at Mahātiṭṭa (Mantotta) opposite the Isle of Mannar (Geiger Trans. p. 59), along with the young ladies and their retinue. Future research must show how far this is actually true. One other small reference is that to the public square where streets intersect called *Nāgacatukkam*. The latter half of the compound is a formation which has its analogue in the Bhūtacatukkam at Puhār at the mouth of the Kāvēri (*Maṇimēkhalā*, Cantos 1, 8, 20 and 22.).

The *Maṇimēkhalai* gives an account of an almsbowl of miraculous power which provided an inexhaustible supply of food to all suffering from hunger. This belonged to a Brahman to whom Chintādēvi (Sarasvati or Goddess of Learning) gave it to relieve people of hunger when famine prevailed. When the need was over and there was no more occasion for any active use of it he placed it in a pond of water at Maṇipallava Island in the neighbourhood of Ceylon. This used to appear above the surface of the water once a year on the anniversary of the Buddha's birth. On one of these anniversaries it came to the hands of Maṇimēkhalā as there was good occasion for the use of it. There is so far no reason to connect this with the almsbowl of the Buddha which was got from Asoka full of relics at the instance of Mahinda by Sumana. This latter after the use of the relics was placed in the palace by Devānāmpiyatissa and worshipped there.

So far the incidents referred to are of a traditional character. Except for a certain similarity of the tradition in regard to these particulars which may warrant the inference either of affiliation of the traditions to each other or of their being traceable to a common source, these cannot be regarded as of any definite historical value. The next one is of a different character and may turn out to be of higher historical value, if not in its actual details, at least in its general features. This brings us in point of time to 187 B. C. according to the scheme of chronology adopted by Geiger.

It was in this year that Suratissa, one of the younger brothers of Tissa, succeeded to the throne of Lanka or

Ceylon. The Chronicle has it that he was known as Suvarṇapiṇḍa-Tissa before his accession. Whether this has any connexion with the Prince in the *Maṇimēkhalai* who is said, on account of his meritorious works, to have been born of a cow in the shape of a golden egg it would be too much to say with the evidence available. It was in his reign that the first Tamil usurpation is recorded in the Chronicle. Two Tamils sons of a freighter who brought horses for sale, conquered the king and ruled justly for twenty-two years. After a restoration of the old dynasty for another decade, came the more important usurpation by the Tamil Eḷāra.

Eḷāra is described as of noble descent who came from the Chōḻa country to seize the kingdom, overpowered the ruler Aśela and ruled for forty-four years with even justice towards friend and foe, on occasions of dispute at law. The king had a bell hung up at the head of his bed which could be rung by those who desired a judgment at Law. The king's only son killed a calf by accidentally running his car over it. The cow came and rang the bell of justice and the king had his son decapitated in the same manner as the calf was. Professor Hultzsch points out the similarity between this and the Śaiva miracle recorded in the *Periyapurāṇam* in regard to the Chōḻa Manu at Tiruvārūr as also the undoubted allusion to it in the *Śilappadhikāram*.

The story of Manu Chōḻa may be traceable to a common source with the Ceylon Chronicle, but neither of them gives any clue to the actual source. The reference in the *Śilappadhikāram* makes the point more clear. This work

couples this incident with another of a similar character and ascribes both of them, as it appears from the manner of the reference, to the same king. The other incident is the well-known story of the king who gave an equal weight of his flesh to save a dove from a hunter. This is one of the Jātaka stories and it occurs in the Brahman Purāṇas in connexion with Śibi, the Emperor. This last is an old Chōḻa according to the Chōḻa genealogies of a later period.

The next act of justice on the part of Eḷāra, the tearing up of a snake to take out the young of a bird may be passed over, but the one that follows is of importance. He was not a Buddhist according to the Chronicle, but when he had damaged a Stupa unwittingly by striking against it in the course of a drive he offered to pay the penalty by saying, 'Sever my head also (from the trunk) by the wheel'. This has a curious resemblance to a story in regard to a Pāṇḍyan king who cut off his right hand for having rudely knocked at the door and caused disturbance to a loving pair in bed.

The third incident in this line is the complaint brought before the king by an old woman whose paddy, spread out to dry in the sun, was damaged by untimely rain. He fasted to bring Indra, the god of rain, to a sense of his duty and got him to order seasonal rain. This is quite similar except for local and artistic details in the story to that of Ugra Pāṇḍyan who compelled Indra by force of his arm to send rain into the Pāṇḍya country, and thus relieved the country from famine.

Though none of the details agree, as details, the same exaggerated idea of justice is ascribed as the principal

characteristic of the great Chōḻa Karikāla. The bell of justice seems quite a common feature. The Pāṇḍya who died of a broken heart for failure of justice in the *Śilappadhikāram* is described as having had this adjunct for judging. This is what again is referred to in a verse which the thirteenth century Oṭṭakkūttan composed in honour of his disciple Kulōttunga II. These differences of detail notwithstanding, there is the fact that Eḻāra was a Tamil of noble descent who came from the Chōḻa country. Can he be identified with Karikāla or one of his ancestors? He might have been one of the predecessors of Karikāla, but no direct identification is possible on the strength of the Chronicle under reference.

The next item that brings the Chronicle into contact with India, this time as a whole, is the assemblage of priests from all parts of the country on the occasion of the consecration of the Great Thupa. The following places contributed the contingents of Bikshus. Rajagāha, Īśipaṭna (Benares), Jētavana, Ghositārma (Kośāmbi), Dakkiṇagiri (Ujjeni), Asokārma (Puppapura), Kasmira, Pallavabhogga, Alasanda (the city of the Yonas), Vindhyan Forests Road, Bodhimaṇḍa (near Buddhagaya), Vanavāsa and the Kelāsavihāra the situation of which is not described. Of these places there is one South Indian place for certain and that is Vanavāsa (Banavase in South Kanara). The other is perhaps the Pallavabhogga. Although it would be hazardous to argue from the order of these places and draw inferences as to their geographical location, Pallavabhogga seems placed in the narrative somewhere about the north-west with the

Alexandria of the Yavanas. The only certain inference possible is that the Pallavas were not as yet in the part of the peninsula where later we are accustomed to look for them both from literature and from inscriptions. In other words the Pallava kingdom of Kānchi had not yet been formed according to the *Mahāvamśa*.

This is a point of considerable importance to Tamil literary history as the same conclusion is inferable from a study of the Tamil classics alone.

The next point of contact is the reign of Vaṭṭagāmaṇi 44–17 B. C. with an interregnum from 44–29 B. C. Immediately after his accession to the throne, he had to meet two dangers that threatened his very existence. The one was an invasion of Ceylon by the Tamils and the other a rebellion by the Brahman Tissa in Rohāṇa. He got rid of the Brahman by setting him to fight the Tamil invaders, but he found the invaders too strong for him. Having been defeated he became a fugitive and lived in hiding for fourteen years in the family of a subject of his through the good offices of a Bikshu. While escaping with his two queens and two sons, he found it necessary to abandon the junior Somalā with his royal crown and the almsbowl of the Buddha. He gave the first to Somalā and hid the bowl in the Vessagiri forest. Of the seven Tamils who invaded Ceylon this time one took Queen Somā with the crown for his share and returned. The other appropriated the almsbowl and followed. The remaining five reigned for fourteen years and seven months. The first of these five was named Pulahatta. Is this Ārya Pirahattan whom Kapilar addresses in *Kurinjippāṭṭu?* He was slain by his commander of

troops Bahiya who in turn was overthrown by his General Paṇayamāra. This last was slain by his Commander of forces Piḷayamāra who in turn was overthrown by Dāṭhika who was finally killed by Vaṭṭagāmaṇi. The capture of the queen Somā, the carrying away of the almsbowl and the names Paṇayamāra and Piḷayamāra may find references in Tamil literature. These last names sound rather like Paḷayan Māran of Mogūr near Madura. In connexion with these there are two other small details which throw some light upon the religious condition of the time. As Vaṭṭagāmaṇi was fleeing from the field of battle a Jain ascetic by name Giri exclaimed in exultation, says the Chronicle, 'The great black lion is flying.' For this insult the *ārāma* where the Jain lived was destroyed and a Vihāra (the Abhayagiri Vihāra) was built in its place. When the seven warriors took umbrage at the severe treatment accorded to one of their number by the despotic monarch, the Bikshus who intervened asked the question whether the Dharma would be advanced by the success of the king or by the prosperity of the Tamils. The answer expected, as in fact the answer given, was that it would prosper under the king. When the king restored himself he called back Somā and reinstated her in her former position as queen. In her honour was built the Somārāma which was also called Maṇisomārāma to bring in the Chūlamaṇi or crown that she had carried with her. It was in this reign that the three *piṭakas* (baskets of the Buddhists) and the *Aṭṭakathā* were written down.

The two sons of Vaṭṭagāmaṇi ruled in succession. The second of these was not a Buddhist and was a rebel. His

name was Cōranāga and he had for his queen Anula. Among the rapid succession of Anula's lovers there are two Tamils, the city-carpenter Vaṭuka and the Damila Brahman Nīliya.

The next reference to South India occurs in the reign of Iḷanāga, A.D. 95 to 101. There was, early in the reign, a rebellion of the clan called the Lambakannas. Iḷanāga, was an exile for three years in India and returned with an army with which he defeated the rebellious clan and regained his throne. There is here a story of Iḷanāga's son and the statement resembles in some details the story of Karikāla. The queen of this prince Chandamukhaśiva had the name Damilādēvi.

In the reign of Vohārikatissa (A.D. 263 to 285) as he was called there was a fratricidal war. He was an enlightened ruler who set aside bodily injury as a penalty. His reign was remarkable for the prevalence of heretical opinion particularly the Vētulya (Vaipulya) doctrine ,which he is said to have suppressed. His brother Abhaya was caught in an intrigue with the queen and had to flee for protection to India. Through the help of a disaffected uncle of his and with the assistance of the Tamils he was eventually able to overthrow his brother and take both the queen and the kingdom.

From A.D. 296 to 315, there was a usurpation, this time by the Lambhakannas of Ceylon. There was a succession of three, namely, Sanghatissa, Sanghabhodhi and Goṭhakābhaya. The second of these was a particularly pious monarch and piety according to the ideals of old goes

generally with incapacity for efficient government. There was naturally a rebellion under the minister-treasurer Goṭhakābhaya and the king had to flee for life. He met a beggar who offered him food out of his litle store and in reward the king asked the beggar to cut off his head and take it to the usurper and secure the reward. The beggar was reluctant and to save him the crime the king gave up the ghost where he sat, so as to enable the beggar to take the head and gain the prince without committing a crime. Such stories are common enough but the point here is it has quite a family resemblance to that given of the patron chief Kumaṇa of the Tamil country (pp. 152–162 of Pandit Swaminatha Iyer's Edition of *Puṟanāṉūṟu*). In the reign of the last of these Goṭhakābhaya (302 to 315) the Vētulya heresy was getting stronger in its following and he is said to have seized sixty of the heretical Bikshus in the Abhaya-girivihāra and banished them to the opposite coast. A Bikshu from the Chōḻa people (by name Sanghamitta) who attached himself to one of the exiled there and who was well versed in the teachings concerning the exorcism of spirits, came over filled with bitter enmity to the priests of the Mahāvihāra monastery and played a decisive part in the assembly arranged for the discussion of the merits of the two schools of Buddhistic teaching. He got the better of it in the argument so much that the king was well pleased with him and appointed him to be in charge of his two sons Jeṭṭatissa and Mahāsēna. By partiality to the latter the Bikshu lost favour with the former who succeeded to the throne after the death of his father. The hostility between the two sects had gone so far that at the funeral of the king, Jeṭṭatissa found that the other sect declined to do the

honour due to the departed sovereign and Jeṭṭatissa in revenge had to perpetrate a massacre of the recalcitrant priests. Sanghamitta was afraid of his life and went away to India till the throne should pass to his favourite pupil Mahāsēna.

Mahāsēna's reign, which according to the scheme of chronology adopted by the learned editor and translator of the *Mahāvamśa* is A.D. 325 to 352, is occupied with the dispute and mutual destruction of the respective monasteries of the two sects. Sanghamitta and the minister Śoṇa were votaries of the new school. Meghavaṇṇābhaya, another minister, was of the other school. This latter revolted against the monarch, and came to terms when the latter had undertaken in a measure to restore the partly destroyed Mahāvihāra. The obnoxious minister and the Choḷiya priest were got rid of by assassination through the intercession of one of the queens. Another then by name Tissa took the place of the dead priest and the Mahāvihāra had again to be evacuated. There could have been no peace and it looks as though there were none. One interesting statement in the midst of all this controversy is that the king destroyed the temples of the Brahmanical gods, among which the phallic Siva finds specific mention, in order to build the Manihīravihāra. Mahāsēna's reign brings the *Mahāvamśa* proper to a close.

Whatever difference of opinion there may be as to the actual dates in the Chronicle there can be no manner of doubt now as to the broader periods. There is very strong ground for accepting Professor Geiger's scheme. There can be no objection to taking the dates as generally correct.

If by gathering together the references to India from the Chronicle we could examine in the light of these whatever information may be available on this side of the sea, there is the likelihood of some confirmation in regard to certain outstanding facts; but it must at the same time be recognized that there is no Chronicle on this side to compare with the *Mahāvamśa*. Regrettable as this absence may be it is advantageous in some respects because the information available would throw an unmeant and perhaps therefore a truer light, upon the matters under consideration.

There is a body of Tamil literature of which some at least has to be referred to this period. Does a study of the Chronicle throw any light upon this question? The object of this study of the Chronicle is to make such a comparative study possible. In what has been gathered above one fact stands out clear that there was considerable intercourse between the island and the mainland, particularly the Chōḻa country. There is again the clear statement that there were Brahman settlements and Brahman temples in the island; that the kind of Buddhism that came from the Chōḻa country was the Mahayāna form whereas that which is traceable to upper India is the Hinayāna. Does this general position find any echo in the literature of this period?

We shall not enter into any examination of specific details on this occasion. We would reserve that for a fuller examination seeing that Mr. L. D. Swamikkannu Pillai joins issue with astronomical data. The *Mahāvamśa*, at least this part, does not mention that Gajabāḥū went to India or built a temple to Pattinīdēvi as the *Śilappadhikāram*

says a Gajabāhu did. But the other side must have better authority than they are able to produce, as this omission may possibly be explained away.

Without in any way anticipating the discussion we have promised to ourselves it may be pointed out that the monks of the Mahāvihāra monastery were under no obligation whatever to mention this fact. The question whether week days were in use in South India before a particular date will have to be examined separately from evidence South Indian. All this and other connected matter will be considered in a detailed study of the ancient literature of the Tamils as they are at present available.

[*Reprinted from the Journal of the Mythic Society, Vol. IV, 127-140.*]

Miscellaneous Communications.

The Kōśar of Tamil Literature and the Satiyaputra of the Asoka Edicts.

On page 84 of the January number of the *Journal* for 1922, there is a note on Satiyaputra of the Asoka Edicts—where a reference is made to my communication in a previous number of the *Journal*. It is stated that I have identified the Satiyaputra of the Asoka Edicts with the Nāyars of Malabar. An extract is quoted from an article by Mr. K. G. Sankara as against this. The points that Mr. Sankara makes out are (1) that the term *Satī* cannot be applied to the matriarchal folk of the West Coast, and that Kēraḷaputra is distinguished from Satiyaputra ; and (2) that Durga devotees, like the Bengalis, are not described as Satiyaputra. In regard to these, it is enough to say that if one set of people took a name from some feature like the worship of Durga it does not logically follow that all the worshippers of Durga should be so named. If a set of people, foreigners to a locality, gave a name to another class of people from a feature that struck them as somewhat peculiar, it need not be correct to the degree indicated in the first part of Mr. Sankara's argument. I do not believe that in the note quoted I have made any attempt to identify the Satiyaputra with the Nāyars precisely. My only contention was that the name had its origin in the matriarchal habits of the people, and that need hardly

include all the matriarchal folk in one group. Mr. Subramanyam, the author of the note under reference, brushes aside my note as well as Mr. Sankara's with the dictum that "what goes for the early history of India is almost an inextricable tangle of proved facts and wild guesses". He proceeds to his own solution of the question in the last three paragraphs of the note in question. Proceeding to define the limits of Cēra, the country lying to the north of it and Kongu, he comes to the solemn conclusion: "I identify the *Satyaputra* with the Kōśars of Kongu Nāḍu."

The form of the word as written in this sentence may lend colour to this conclusion, but has no warrant whatsover in the inscriptional records of Asoka. That was the discussion with which my note started—whether "*Satiya*" can be treated as the equivalent of "*Satya*". I found it impossible to make the conclusion, and hence proceeded to give the explanation that I did in 1919, when I had all the information about the Kōśar that I have put together in the following paragraphs. It may be useful to invite attention to these data.

I am not transliterating the Tamil texts, as the whole of them will appear in the revised edition of my *Ancient India*, which is in preparation. Those who wish to go further into the study of these will have an opportunity to study them there.

Kōśar.—They are referred to as entering the country of Tuḷu by defeating Nannan and killing his state elephant.*

---

* Paraṇar in *Kuruṁtogai* 73.

Nannan's territory included in it both Tuḷu* and Konkan† (Koṅkāṇam). These Kōśar are under reference in *Aham* 196 as having put out the eyes of the father of a lady, Anni Gñimili, and to have been destroyed at her instance by two chieftains, Kurumbiyan and Tidiyan.‡ They are found mentioned as Kongu-iḷam-Kōśar in the *Śilappadhikāram*, § and are associated with the Kongu country (Salem and Coimbatore) districts. One clan of them is associated with Podiyil hill, and the tribe that settled there became known as Nallūr Kōśar.¶ In the same terms Māmūlanār describes the Kōśar as winning a victory against their enemies at Podiyil hill, and, as Mōhūr declined to submit to them, the Mauryas advanced south.‖ The other poets, such as Marudan Iḷanākan, Kallāḍanār, Nakkīrar and Aiyūr Muḍavanār, make mention of these Kōśar also. Of these the first and the fourth associate the Kōśar with Śellūr. It seems to have been a place in the Chōḷa country.** Nakkīrar's reference is to a Chōḷa having made an effort to conquer their territory. Kallāḍanār's reference is to their having protected on one occasion the chieftain Aḥdai. They, therefore, seem to have been a well-known tribe of people, foreigners to the Tamil country, who settled in various localities ultimately, and came to be known as Nālūr Kōśar, "settled in four towns," if the particular reading of the

---

* Māmūlanār in *Aham* 15.

† Pālai-pāḍiya Perumkaḍuṅgō in *Naṟṟiṇai* 391.

‡ Paraṇar in *Aham* 196 and 262.

§ M. M. Svāminātha Aiyar's edn., p. 3, l. 2.

¶ *Kuruṁtogai* 15. Perumkaḍuṅgō.

‖ *Aham* 251.

** *Aham* 90 and 220.

first word is correct. Who were these Kōśar, and what was their connexion with the Mauryas? The suggestion was made elsewhere* that these may be a tribe of people, the same as the Kōśakāras of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and it is possible they were the Khaśas, who led the advance part of the army that marched upon Pāṭalīputra in favour of Chandragupta according to the drama *Mudrārākṣasa*. According to Manu (x, 20 and 22 these were Kṣatriya Vrātyas who, according to Uśanas, were water-carriers and distributors of water at fountains. They were a people who had a great reputation in the south as warriors, and are described invariably as people who kept their word. Kāri-Kaṇṇan of Kāvērippaṭṭaṇam refers to the practice of the younger members of this tribe learning the use of weapons by hurling them against a pillar made of the wood of the *muruṅgai*† (*Erythrina Indica*) tree. The four places of their establishment, if the reading Nālūr is not a corruption of Nallūr,‡ would be the Nallūr near Podiyil hill; Śellūr, probably in the Chōḻa country on the east coast§; Pāḻi, wherefrom they

* *Beginning of the South Indian History*, pp. 94–5.

† *Puṟam* 169.

‡ That the Kōśar were known in four divisions is clearly stated in ll. 508–9 of the Maduraik-Kāñji. The author there institutes a comparison between the appearance of the four groups of councillors at the Pāṇḍyan court (other than the ministers) and the coming of the four sections of the Kōśar of "unfailing word".

§ There is a Śellūr between the railway station, Koraḍāchēri, in the Tanjore-Negapatam line, and Koḍaivāśal, a place of some importance now, and of great repute in the age of the Śaṅgam. The only objection to the identification is that it is not as near the sea as the text would require. The local Aiyanār (Śāsta) temple seems identifiable with the "sacrificial abode" of Paraśurāma.

were dislodged by the Chōḻas, in the Cēra country; and Koṅgu south-east from this territory.

Thus it is clear that the Kōśar, whoever they were, were a class of men who enjoyed a reputation in the Tamil country for determination and truth, for great military prowess, and for being wealthy as a result of trade. They were apparently in occupation of the Tuḷu country, which is referred to almost as their home territory.* If the reading *Nallūr* is correct, they had a settlement in the south-west corner of the Madura district. But their most important settlement seems to have been Śellūr, which is referred to clearly as having the sea towards the east of it, and is described as the place which offered worship to all of the gods, and where Paraśurāma celebrated the sacrifice which brought to an end his destruction of the Kshatriyas. It was at the end of this sacrifice, according to the Purāṇic story, that he made a gift of the earth he had conquered to the Rishi patriarch Kaśyapa. Śellūr therefore must have been on or near the east coast, and may have memorials of its associations with Paraśurāma. There are a number of places having this association, as, for instance, the town of Kolar, which has a small Paraśurāma temple on the bund of the tank to the east of the town. But this Śellūr seems to refer to the village near Koḍaivāśal, about 7 miles south-west of Kumbhakonam, which was a place of considerable importance and great repute in the age of the Śaṅgam. It is some distance away from the sea, but may barely satisfy the requirements of the text. The local Aiyanār temple has traditions which may associate it with Paraśurāma, as was

* *Aham* 15.

already stated. There is a Śellūr mentioned in the *Kēraḷōl-patti*, the traditional history of Malabar, which is spoken of as Parum-Śellūr, associated undoubtedly with Paraśurāma, but as a place where he performed his penance after the sacrifice and the gift to Kaśyapa. The attribute "*parum*" before the word would certainly indicate the existence of another Śellūr, from which this had to be distinguished. This is closely associated in Malabar tradition with Gōkarṇam, and has to be looked for on that coast. Ēḻilmalai (Saptaśaila), near Cannanore, has associations with Paraśu-rāma, being known as Rāmantaḷi (temple of Rāma). There perhaps will be found the Parum-Śellūr of Malabar tradi-tion.

The habitual attribute given to these Kōśar in literature, "the Kōśar of unfailing word," has led to the ingenious suggestion that they might be the *Satiyaputra* of the edicts of Asoka. Their association with the Tuḷu country would seem to support the identification. It is doubtful, however, whether the *Satiyaputra* of the edicts can be regarded as equivalent to *Satyaputra* literally translatable into "sons of truth". There is besides the chronological difficulty. They are spoken of in some of the passages quoted above as entering the Tuḷu country recently in the days of the poet Paraṇar and possibly even Māmūlar. It would therefore be too much to infer that in the days of Asoka the Kōśar were a people so closely associated with the Tuḷu country that they gave the name to the region.

[*Reprinted from the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, London, 1923.*]

The Konkan and Konkani Language and Mont D'Eli

In his review of the Konkan and the Konkani language by Dr. V. P. Chavan, Mr. Edwardes suggests a derivation for the term 'Konkan', deriving the word from 'Kongu' on the analogy of the Kanarese form *Tenkaṇa*. He rightly rejects the Sanskrit derivation of the word suggested by the author as unconvincing, but his alternative suggestion does not take us much nearer a convincing derivation of the word. The word Konkan in its present form is the Kanarese form; but in classical Tamil literature, the term occurs in the Tamil form Koṇ-Kānam. What is more, this region is treated as the kingdom of a chieftain, whose rule extended over the neighbouring territory even of Tuḷu. In one poem of the *Puṛanānūṛu*, the territory is spoken of as *Koṇ-Perum-Kānam*. The last word in both the expressions means in Tamil 'forest.' The meaning of the first is not quite so clear. It comes from the root '*koḷ*', originally 'to take.' By a transition it comes to be 'taking that which is not one's own.' In that sense that same class of Tamil literature uses the term in the following forms :—'*Koḷ*,' '*Koḷḷai*' of '*Koṇḍi*,' all of them alike signifying 'plunder' or 'spoils of war.' Therefore, ordinarily Koṇ-Kānam ought to mean the forest where any thing that can be taken possession of by anybody that wishes to; in other words, it is a 'no-man's

land', from which anybody can appropriate any thing that can be appropriated. This has reference mainly to driving off cattle; cattle grazing in the forest could be taken possession of by anybody that cared. The term interpolated between the two merely means 'great' and gives the clearest possible indication that the two terms are intended to mean what they actually do in Tamil literature. So Konkan would be the vast region of forest from which those who chose might take possession of what they liked.

Whether this Tamil name was applied to a foreign country, or whether it was actually Tamil land may be a more doubtful question; but all the indications in classical Tamil literature give one the idea that it was a Tamil kingdom under a Tamil chief, who was also chief of Tuḷu and who had his capitals and fortresses and hills, and the other paraphernalia of a kingdom. The chief who is referred to is Nannan, and he has been handed down to ill-fame as the killer of a woman, so that in Tamil literature he is called generally Nannan, the woman-killer, to distinguish him from his son who bore the same name and who is called Nannan,* the son of Nannan, whose territory lay inland in the eastern portion of Kongu in the generation following.

This brings us to another geographical item animadverted upon by Sir Richard Temple both in the *JRAS.* and in the *Indian Antiquary*. It is the famous Mont D'Eli. Sir Richard felt very easily persuaded by what Mr. Subramania Ayyar said, on the authority of the Sanskrit *Kāvya Mūshakavamśa,*' the mediæval work, that the

* *Pattuppāṭṭu*, 10.

late Mr. Gopinatha Rao published, in regard to the origin of the term. Because of the expressions *Mūshaka-vamśa* and *Mūshaka-nāḍu*, Mr. Subramania Ayyar jumped to the conclusion that Mont D'Eli can mean nothing more than 'mountain of the bandicoot or rat.' He went on to characterise the translation *Sapta Śaila* as unwarranted manufacture on the part of the Sanskrit-knowing Brahman. It is a matter for regret that we should be too ready to divine intentions on the part of authors of mischievous derivations and details, when a little closer inspection may prove useful. The *Kāvya Mūshaka-vamśa* and the country Mūshaka cannot be held to supply us with the origin of the name Mont D'Eli, when we have very much more authentic sources of information regarding the place. Mont D'Eli of the geographers is undoubtedly the hill surrounded by numbers of rivers and streams, 16 miles to the north of Cannanore, which the writers of the Tamil classics always refer to distinctly as *Ēḻ-il-kuṉṟam.** The first term is seven, the second may mean a house, and the third is hill, which in the mouth of a Malayalam-speaking moderner would become *Elimalā* by a process of phonetic decay, which can be easily understood by one acquainted with the language. Hence the Brahmanical translation *Sapta Śaila* has very much more warrant than the suggestion that the Eli there was a *Mūshaka*. I believe nobody will adduce the argument that these Tamil classics, whatever their actual age, were later than the *Mūshaka-vamśa*. So the translation *Sapta Śailam* is quite a regular translation of the Tamil name.

---

* *Naṟṟiṇai*, 391 as above.

That does not give the explanation of the Mont D'Eli, or Hill, as the Arabs have it. The clearest explanation is that it is a translation of the Malayalam expression, as the Sanskrit is a translation of the Tamil. If to the first foreign visitor of the coast or promontory the name had been given as Elimalā, and if he wanted as a mere matter of curiosity to know what exactly it meant, the obvious member of the compound *mala* is easily explained as hill or mount ; and what about *Eli?* If the person who used the term Elimalā had the notion that it had anything to do with the *Eli* (rat), he could have offered the explanation then and there, and the translator would not have called it Mont Deli ; but instead of *Eḷi*, he would have put the equivalent of the rodent in his own language. The fact that *Eli* has been retained is a clear indication that the foreigner was not able to understand the term, and could not get a satisfactory explanation of it from his informant. The suggestion that the term *Eli* meant the rat and nothing else, would have struck the native of the locality as very queer. The only possible explanation of the term '*il*' that I can suggest is *house*, and that could only mean that the hill and its slopes were the property of seven *illams* or households of the Malabar coast. Hence Mont D'Eli is an unconscious rendering of the accurate early Tamil name, only somewhat corrupted as it passed through Malayalam, but not quite clearly understood by the first foreigner who coined the term, whether he were Arab, Persian or European.

There is an interesting note on this on page 1, Vol. II, of Longworth Dames' edition of the *Book of Duarte*

Barbosa. Mr. Thorne, I.C.S., whose note is included in it, labours to derive the term Deli from Taḷi in Ramandally. This would be unexceptionable, if the form of the word were Deli. The Arab word is Hili, and the European equivalent seems to be merely D'Eli, meaning the *hill of Eli* for Mont D'Eli.

[*Reprinted from the Indian Antiquary, Vol. LIV, 1925.*]

The Age of Nammalvar

Under the unpretentious heading "Some Points in the Archæological Report for 1902–03" Mr. Pichaimuthu, B.A., L.T., discusses in the pages of the *Christian College Magazine*, for February 1904 the date of Nammāḻvār, one of the twelve Vaishṇava saints of Southern India and arrives at the conclusion that "it is likely he lived in the ninth century A.D." Mr. Gopinatha Rao. M.A., arrives at the same conclusion by another line of argument. This conclusion, if correct, would be another milestone in Tamil Literary history, and it will be excused if I venture in the same field and offer a few of my own observations on the same subject, having had occasion to study some parts at least of the literature bearing on this question. Before proceeding to state my own views on the question however, it will be well to pass in review the arguments adduced in favour of the conclusions already arrived at by those who have preceded me in this question.

Mr. Pichaimuthu arrives at his conclusion from the following considerations :—

"The works of Nammāḻvār are called Drāviḍa Veda. Madhurakavi had them published and established their sacredness before a council of 300 men under the presidency of the royal poet, Kambanāṭṭāḻvār, during the Saṅga days of the Pāṇḍya kings."

"It is popularly supposed that Kambanāḍan visited the Pāṇḍya capital of Madura. It is likely that in one of his visits, he approved of the works of Nammāḻvār, a descendant of the Paṇḍya kings." Mr. Pichaimuthu further observes that there was a Vaishṇava revival between the eighth and the eleventh centuries A.D. "Before that the days of Māṇikkavāśagar, the Pāṇḍya and Iḻa kings were Buddhists."

Mr. Gopinatha Rao whose article appeared in a recent number of "Śeṅ Tamil," the organ of the Madura Tamil Śaṅgam, argued that as Nādhamuni learnt the *Tiruvāymoḻi* from Madhurakavi, the disciple of Nammāḻvār, this last and Nādhamuni must have been contemporaneous, and inferred the ninth century A.D. from the recognised contemporaneity of Kamban and Nādhamuni.

Pending a fuller examination of the history of the Āḻvārs, which I hope to find time to make at an early date, I may here examine these considerations adduced as making for the ninth century A.D., as the epoch of this Āḻvār, one of the oldest and in fact the greatest among the Āḻvārs, and suggest what appears to me the more probable age of Nammāḻvār.

To take up Mr. Gopinatha Rao's case first, it is no doubt true according to the *Guruparamparai* (the traditional chronicle of successive gurus of the Vaishṇavas) that Nādhamuni the first of the Āchāryas (preceptors as opposed to the Āḻvārs or saints) went to Āḻvār Tirunagari to gain a knowledge of the *Tiruvāymoḻi* (the sacred word of Nammāḻvār) not from the Āḻvār or his disciple but to learn

it from any one who knew it, having failed to obtain knowledge of it from every other probable source of the knowledge. This had been published and learnt up largely for a time; but had fallen into desuetude. Nādhamuni attempted a revival. No doubt the story has it that he got it at last from Nammāḻvār and Madhurakavi both appearing to him for this special purpose. Long before the days of Nādhamuni, the latest of the Āḻvārs. Tirumangaimannan had built a shrine and arranged for the recital of the *Tiruvāymoḻi* in Śrīrangam. This arrangement having been allowed to fall into desuetude, Nādhamuni had to revive it and for this very purpose he had to make the pilgrimage to Āḻvār Tirunagari. I shall in the course of the paper, shew other reasons for regarding the view as being untenable and will take up the other case for consideration.

Nammāḻvār's works are not merely called, by the courtesy of posterity, the Drāviḍa Veda, but are professedly the rendering of the Vedas in Tamil. The *Tiruvāymoḻi* 1,000 being the substance of the Sāma Veda, the *Tiruviruttam* 100, the *Tiruvāśiriyam* 7 and *Periyatiruvandādi* 100 are respectively the rendering, in brief, of the Rig, Yajus and Atharva Vedas.

According to tradition no doubt Madhurakavi published the *Tiruvāymoḻi* and may have got its sacredness acknowledged in the Śaṅgam Assembly—but certainly not under the presidency of Kamban, for Kamban never did preside, nor ever could have, over the Śaṅgam, as will presently be shewn.

Kamban, the author of the *Rāmāyaṇam* often refers in the course of his work to a patron, not a royal sovereign, but

a plain Mudaliar by name Sadayappah of Vennainallūr. It is highly improbable that, if ever he had a royal patron, he would not at all have mentioned his name, while he systematically refers to Sadayappah at almost regular intervals. Again so far as I know the story, he is said to have betaken himself to the Cēra court and not to the Pāṇḍya, but the details of the story stamp it as untrue in the main. Even according to tradition the Śaṅgam is said to have gone out of existence with Kūn Pāṇḍya or Sundara Pāṇḍya or Neḍumāran the contemporary and disciple of Tirugñāna Sambanda (Seventh Century A.D.).

If Kamban was ever in a position to preside over the Śaṅgam, how was it that he had to wander from place to place seeking approval for his *Rāmāyaṇam?* He had to get the approval of the 3,000 Brahmins of Chidambaram and of the assembly of divines at Śrīrangam. Over this assembly presided Nādhamuni and it was to please him and his confreres that he had to compose and recite the *Saḍagōparandādi* 100 in praise of Nammāḻvār. In the face of this work, it is passing strange that the two gentlemen should have so thoroughly mistaken the relation of Kamban to Nammāḻvār.

Further Mr. Pichaimuthu states that there was a Vaishṇava revival between the eighth and the eleventh centuries A.D. It may be, but what is there to connect the Āḻvārs with *this* revival? It is, to say the least, misleading to state that the prevailing religion before that time was Śaiva. If it does nothing else, this begs the question. We have abundant reference to Vaishṇavas and their temples much anterior to this, not only in literature but

also in inscriptions. Not to mention others. Kōchchengan Chōḻa built temples to Vishṇu and Śiva alike; and this could not have been merely for theoretical impartiality without a practical demand. Paramēśvara Varman Pallava and his grandfather built temples to Vishṇu at Kānchi and Mahābalipuram.

That the Pāṇḍya and Iḻā kings were Buddhist before the days of Mānikkavaśagar proves nothing in this connection, as in fact Kūn Pāṇḍya was a Buddhist. The fact is that from very early times the votaries of these different religions lived together and it did not make much difference generally what the particular persuasion of the ruler for the time being was.

To return to Nammāḻvār. As has been pointed out already, Nammāḻvār's works had long been published and had acquired wide celebrity, but could not be got at in the days of Nādhamuni except at the Āḻvār's brithplace. This celebrity could not have been attained in a short period of time in those days. Nadhmuni was, according to the most reliable tradition, the contemporary of Kamban whose work *Śaḍagōparandādi* deifies the Āḻvār. This circumstance again suggests considerable lapse of time. Rāmānuja the famous reformer of the Vaishṇavas, came in the fifth generation from Nādhamuni, not in official succession only but also in actual descent; and Rāmānuja's life (A. D. 1017—A. D. 1137) is coeval with the Chōḻa ascendency in Southern India. Nādhamuni, therefore, we must assign at least to a century earlier, and this brings us quite close to the traditionl Śaka 807 (A. D. 885) for Kambana's *Rāmāyaṇam*. No sound argument against this date for Kamban

has, so far as I know, been brought forward except the statement that the Chōḻa ruler at the time was a Rājēndra (identified with Kulōttunga I). The name Rājēndra is so common among the rulers of the Chōḻa dynasty that we cannot at all be positive as to which personage it actually refers to without extraneous support. Even for this mere statement there is no very good authority.

If then Nādhamuni lived about A. D. 900 we must go back for Tirumangai Āḻvār a century or two, so as to allow time from his arrangements at Śrīrangam for the worship of Nammāḻvār to fall into desuetude. We must go back again from this time for Nammāḻvār, if already he had become a saint worthy of being worshipped in a public place of worship of the dignity of "The Temple" of the Vaishṇavas (Śrīrangam).

Reserving a fuller examination of Tirumangai Āḻvār's history for a future occasion, it is quite in place to remark here that his and Kulasekharāḻvār's works were considered of sufficient sanctity to warrant provision being made for their recital by Prince Chōḻa Kēṛala, viceroy of Kongu about A. D. 1050. This apart, one of the most unfamiliar of the birudas or titles of Tirumangai Āḻvār had already become a name assumed by Vaishṇavas, as we have Araṭṭamukki-dāsan among the inscriptions of Rājarāja II, about A. D. 1150. To crown all, there are inscriptions in the temple at Ukkal near Māmanḍūr dated about A. D. 1000, which gives the name of the god as Tiruvāymoḻi Dēva. *Tiruvāymoḻi* is the work *sui generis* of Nammāḻvār, and that a god should be named after it speaks for considerable

antiquity for the work. Dr. Hultzsch is of opinion that "Nammāḻvār must have lived centuries before A. D. 1000."

Coupled with these considerations, there is the fact that Nammāḻvār deliberately worked at popularizing the 'hidden lore', the Vedas. This could have been only when the Dravidian Hindus were preparing for the supersession of Buddhism by Brahmanism, no more to be the recondite lore of the learned Brahmans only. This theory finds powerful support in the fact that the works of Nammāḻvār, in comparison with those of later Āḻvārs, are peculiarly free from any caustic reflections on the Śaivas. Under the circumstances, I am inclined to think that we shall have to look for the age of Nammāḻvār in the period of struggle between Buddhism and Brahmanism for mastery in South India, and that period is between A. D. 500 and A. D. 700.

[*Reprinted from the Christian College Magazine for 1904.*]

Tirumangai Alvar and his Date

Paradoxical as it may seem, it is nevertheless the fact that, although a great deal has been written concerning the *Vaishṇava Saints* and devotees, their history has yet to be written. There has, unfortunately, been too great a tendency in the writers, great and small, to refer them to periods, more as it suited their preconceived notions as to the recent origin of Vaishṇavism in general, than on any dispassionate examination of such evidence, imperfect in its nature of course, as is available. It would not be going over quite a beaten track to bring together here such *historical information* as has been brought to light, setting aside the extreme Śaiva arguments of Tirumalaikkolundu Pillai and his school on the one side and the ardent Vaishṇava view of A. Govinda Charlu and his school on the other. This is not because I do not appreciate their learning, but because the one school would deem nothing impossible of belief, while the other would see nothing that could not be made to lend itself to giving the most ancient of these saints a date somewhere about the end of the first millennium after Christ. Gopinatha Rao belongs to a different school, and in his recent ambitious attempt (in the *Madras Review* for 1905) at a *history of Vaishṇavism* in South India, he has come to certain conclusions, which would certainly have commanded assent but for a too transparent tendency to establish certain conclusions.

Without pretending to say the last word on the subject, I shall merely put forward certain *facts and arguments*

I have been able to gather in my studies and the notes that I have made from the writings of some of my friends, who have been pursuing similar research, and leave it to my readers to draw their own conclusions, while not depriving myself of the pleasure of making such inferences as appear to me warranted. I may at the outset acknowledge my obligations to my friend, Pandit Raghavaiyangar, Assistant Editor of the *Śeṅ Tamil*, who has with remarkable courtesy placed some of his notes at my disposal, and has been of great help to me in looking up references, &c., to literature.

The Vaishṇavas, like their *confreres* of other sects, trace their hierarchy of *gurus* (preceptors in religion) from God himself. Putting the translunary part on one side and coming down to *terra firma*, their list consists of names divided into *two broad classes*, entitled, in Vaishṇava parlance, *the Āḻvārs* and *Āchāryas*. *There are twelve among the former and a large number among the latter*, which is being added to by each separate sect or unit at the decease of the existing *guru* for the time being. Without going into the details of the hagiology of these saints and preceptors, we are enabled to collect the *Āḻvārs*, from the traditional accounts alone, into *three groups*—the ancient, the middle, and the last.

The list of the Twelve Āḻvārs, with their traditional dates of birth, is as follows :—

Ancient.	Poygai Āḻvār...	...	B.C.	4203
	Bhūtattār ...	...	,,	4203
	Pēy Āḻvār ...	...	,,	4203
	Tirumaḻiśai Āḻvār	...	,,	4203

Middle.	Namm Āḻvār...	... B.C.	3102
	Madhurakavi	... ,,	3102
	Kulaśēkhara ...	... ,,	3075
	Periy Āḻvār ...	... ,,	3056
	Āṇḍāḷ ...	... ,,	3005
Last ...	Toṇḍaraḍippoḍi	... ,,	2814
	Tiruppāṇ Āḻvār	... ,,	2760
	Tirumangai Āḻvār	... ,,	2706

Disregarding these apparently definite dates, in which, however, most Tamil works, particularly those of a religious character, are peculiarly weak, it is still possible to regard *this traditional order* as fairly in chronological sequence. Even the Vaishṇava hagiologists have very little to say about the first group. Their information about the second is meagre, while of the third they have something to say that might be historical. The name at the head of the paper is the very last, and there are certain facts concerning him, which cannot lightly be passed over by any one who would try to examine the chronology of the Āḻvārs.

Tirumangai Āḻvār is the author of the largest number (1,361 stanzas) of the 4,000 verses of the Vaishṇava *Prabhandam*, *Namm Āḻvār* coming next with a number almost as great. He belonged to the *Kaḷḷar Caste* and was born at Kurugūr in Āli Nāḍu in the Shiyāli taluka of the *Tanjore District*. There he pursued, when he grew up to man's estate, the profession of his father, which was of a duplex character—the government of a small district

under the reigning Chōḻa and playing the knight of the highway, in both of which capacity he appears to have achieved great distinction. The critical stage of his life was reached when he fell in love with the *foundling daughter of a Vaishṇava physician*, who would not marry him unless he reformed and became a Vaishṇava. He went to *Tirunaraiyūr*, near Kumbhakonam, and there received the sacrament. He was not yet to gain the object of his desire, as the young lady insisted upon his feeding 1,008 Vaishṇavas a day for a whole year. This he could do only by plundering wayfarers, which he did, consoling himself with the idea that he was doing it in the name of God. A second transformation was yet in store for him. One night he waylaid a Brahman bridal party, and was probably stricken with remorse for the very enormity of this deed. He there received from the Brahman, who was no other than God himself come in human shape to fulfil his ends on earth, *that mysterious 'mantra' the name Nārāyaṇa*. On being thus blessed, he broke out into verse and his first 'decad' of verse makes this confession. Thereafter he began visiting all the shrines sacred to Vishṇu, and at last settled in *Śrīrangam*, to spend the rest of his days in the service of God, and to rebuild some parts and remodel others of the great shrine, the funds for which he had to find by demolishing the great Buddhist shrine at Negapatam. Having done this to his satisfaction and provided for the recital of Namm Āḻvār's *Tiruvāymoḻi* annually at Śrīrangam he passed away. This, without any of the embellishments of the hagiologists, is the life-story of the man but not of the saint, for which the curious might read A. Govinda Charlu's *Holy Lives of the Āḻvārs*.

Let us now proceed to examine what historical reliance can be placed upon this story. The materials for the history of these sainted personages are entirely traditional and we can attach to the details only as much value as can safely be attached to mere traditions. The general tenor of the life may be correct, while we ought not to insist on details with too much certainty. Even in this modified sense the story does not enlighten us as to the age of the Āḻvār and his actual doings. But there are *the monuments* of the labours of *Tirumangaimannan, viz.*. his works in the *Prabhanda* and the buildings he undertook in *the temple at Śrīrangam.* It is certainly very unfortunate that tradition has not preserved the Chōḻa ruler whose vassal the Āḻvār was. This omission is significant of the fact that he was not contemporaneous with any great Chōḻa ruler, although even these latter are never named specifically enough under similar circumstances.

That he was the latest of the saints is amply borne out by the fact that he celebrates most, if not all, of the now well-known temples to Vishṇu in India, while others celebrate only a few. *The destruction of the rich Buddhist sanctuary at Negapatam* and the frequent references he makes to the Buddhists themselves in his works would refer us to times anterior to the centuries of Chōḻa ascendency, which is again indirectly borne out by the robber chieftain having been successful in his defiance of his Chōḻa suzerain. That Negapatam was the headquarters of a Buddhist sect is borne out by the references to the place in such Tamil Classics as the *Perumbāṇāṟṟuppaḍai* and so on, and the fact is attested even to-day by a place

not far off being known as *Buddankōṭṭam*, although it is now a Brahman village. These facts, in conjunction with references to the Pallavas in the *Periyatirumoḻi, would refer the Āḻvār to the age of the Pallava Ascendency previous to the rise of that Chōḻa Power which wielded imperial sway over South India from the tenth to the fourteenth century after Christ.*

The Pallava Ascendency was coeval with that of the early Western Chāḷukya period and vanished not long after the rise of the Rāshṭrakūṭas, who overthrew their enemies, the Western Chāḷukyas. Before adducing positive evidence that tends towards this conclusion, we have to examine critically the opinions offered by others as to the age of the Āḻvār. Bishop Caldwell and those who followed him could be excused if they held that these were disciples of Rāmānuja, as now-a-days Gopinatha Rao is willing to believe that *Tirumangai Āḻvār* and other later Āḻvārs *were contemporaries, if not actually disciples, of Āḷavandār, Rāmānuja's great grandfather.* In support of this view he quotes a stanza from a work called *Kōiloḻuhu*, which is a history of the Śrīrangam Temple. In the stanza a street, called after Tirumangai Āḻvār, comes after a street called after a Rājamahēndra. This latter is identified with the son and successor of the Rājēndra who fought the battle of Koppam in 1052 A.D. *Hence he infers that Tirumangai Āḻvār must have lived in the latter half of the 11th century?**

That *Rāmānuja* had read and had derived much wisdom from the works of this last of the Āḻvārs is in

* *Madras Review*, Feb. and May, 1905—History of the Śrī Vaishṇava Movement.

evidenc e, so as to satisfy the most fastidious student of history, in the *centum* known as the *Rāmānujanūṟ-ṟandhādi*, a work composed during the lifetime of Rāmānuja by a convert and pupil of his own disciple *Kūratt Āḻvār*. This connection between Amudan, the author of the *centum*, and Kūratt Āḻvār is borne out by stanza 7 of the *centum* and the old *Guruparamparai* of Pinbaḻagiya Jīyar, stanzas 8—21. The former acknowledges Rāmānuja's indebtedness to all the twelve Āḻvārs and the two early Āchāryās, Nādhamuni and his grandson Āḷavandār. This inconvenient piece of evidence has been accorded no place in the array of evidence and authorities passed in review by Gopinatha Rao.

To pass on to the positive evidence available, the *Vaishṇavas always regarded the Āḻvārs higher in spiritual estate than the Āchāryās, not merely as such, but also as being more ancient*, and they must have had some reason for making this distinction. If Tirumangai Āḻvār and others of that class had been disciples of Āḷavandār, why call this latter only an Āchārya and his disciples Āḻvārs, the idols of the Āḻvārs being placed in temples and worshipped, while those of most of the Āchāryās are not. Leaving this aside as the outcome of a most unreasonable partiality on the part of the Vaishṇavas, we have *other evidence* to fall back upon. Inscriptions of Rajārāja II, about the middle of the 12th century, contain the unusual name *Araṭṭamukki Dāsan*—the first part of which is a special *title of Tirumangai Āḻvār*. Next, prince Chōḷa-Kēraḷa, about the middle of the 11th century, made provision for the recital of *Tiruneḍundāndakam*,* one of

* Epigraphist's *Report* for 1900, p. 10.

the works of Tirumangai Āḻvār, which would be extraordinary if he had been living at the time and working to accumulate merit and earn his title to saintliness, especially as his life was, during the greater part of it, far from saintly.

That *Tirumangai Āḻvār was not a disciple of Āḷavandār* is also made probable by a stanza in praise of his work by Tirukkōṭṭiyūr Nambi, from whom Rāmānuja had to learn, which goes to show that this Āḻvār's works had been regularly studied and handed down from preceptor to disciple for some time at least. Again, the conquering Chōḻa brothers, Rājādhirāja, who fell at the battle of Koppam, and his younger brother Rājēndra who succeeded him, had an elder brother by name Āḷavandān If this name had been given to him because of the Āchārya, the latter must have been anterior to him by a considerable interval, as even now the name is specially Vaishṇava.

This would make Āḷavandār's grandfather Nādhamuni. much prior to the age ascribed to him by Gopinatha Rao. He lays much stress upon the fact that Nādhamuni was accustomed to going to Gangaikoṇḍa Chōḻapuram, founded by Gangaikoṇḍa Chōḻa, in 1024 A.D. This is a detail which cannot be looked upon as a crucial piece of evidence, as it is possible that the hagiologists alone are responsible for it. When the earliest among them wrote the lives of their saints, they were so accustomed to Gangaikoṇḍa Chōḻapuram as the Chōḻa capital, that when they heard that Nādhamuni visited the Chōḻa ruler, they naturally put down Gangaikoṇḍa Chōḻapuram as the Chōḻa capital. It certainly would not be unreasonable to ascribe Nādhamuni

to a period in the earlier half of the 10th century A.D. This is exactly the conclusion warranted by the proper understanding of the traditional account, which is that Nādhamuni was born in A.D. 582 and that he was in what is called *Yōga Samādhi* for 340 years. This would give the date A.D. 922 for the death of Nādhamuni, which is not at all improbable, taking all circumstances into consideration. But why did the hagiologists then ascribe this long life or long death in life to Nādhamuni? The explanation is not far to seek. They believed, and the Vaishṇavas do believe even now, that there was an unbroken succession of these saints, and unfortunately they found a gap between Nādhamuni and the last Āḻvār. This they bridged over this clumsy fashion.*

If the above view of the connection between the Āḻvārs and the Āchāryas is correct, then we shall have to look for Tirumangai Āḻvār two or three centuries earlier than Nādhamuni, and this would take us to the seventh or the eighth century of the Christian era. This is certainly warranted by the frequent references to the *Pallavas* † and by none at all to the modern Chōḻas, even to the Chōḻa Rājamahēndra, who did so much for the Śrīrangam Temple. According to Gopinatha Rao, the only Chōḻa who is referred to by the Āḻvār, and referred to elaborately, is the ancient *Chōḻa Kōchchengaṉ* in the decad regarding Tirunaraiyūr.

---

* If Kalhaṇa, the professed historian of Kāśmīr, did the same with respect to early rulers of Kāśmīr in the first centuries A.D., is it wonderful that these hagiologists fell into such a trap?

† See p. 486, Vol. III., *Śeṅ Tamil*, Pandit M. Raghavaiyangar's article.

This, in combination with references to the Śaṅgam in the body of the work, brings him later than the age of either. But another decad in praise of the Paramēśvara Viṇṇagar at Kānchi gives in great detail the achievements of a Pallava ruler, whom Dr. Hultzsch considers to be identical with *Paramēśvaravarman II*, from the name of the shrine. This is not a necessary inference, as any other Pallava paramount sovereign might have had the title Pallava Paramēśvara, and the foundation, when contracted, might have become Paramēśvara Viṇṇagaram, *e.g.*, Vidya Vinita Pallava Paramēśvaram. And notwithstanding the details given in the decad, it does not find support from what is known of Paramēśvaravarman II. This Pallava sovereign, whatever his name, won victories over his enemies at Maṇṇai, Nenmeli, and Karūr. At Karūr he fought against the Pāṇḍya and at Nenmeli against the Villava (Cēra), but the enemy at Maṇṇai is not specified. If these names could be identified with places where Udaya Chandra won victories for his master Nandivarman Pallavamalla or Nandipōttarāja, then the Āḻvār must have lived after *Nandivarman*, or, at the earliest, during his reign.

Among these victories we find mention of a defeat of the Pāṇḍyas at *Maṇṇaikkuḍi* and the taking of *Kālidurgā*.* Maṇṇaikkuḍi may be the Āḻvār's Maṇṇai, and Kāḻidurga, the Āḻvār's "Kuṅrail." Karūr as such does not find mention in the inscriptions. It may be that this name refers to an incident in which Udaya Chandra played no part. Then

* Vide *S. Ind. Ins.* Vol. II, Pt. III, No. 74. Fleet, *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. I, Pt. II, pp. 326-7.

comes Nelvēli, where Udaya Chandra won a victory; but the Āḻvār speaks of Nenmeli, and the war was between the Pallava and the Cēra (Villavan). It is probable that these separate incidents refer to different Pallava princes who worshipped Vishṇu at the Paramēśvara Viṇṇagaram shrine. Whatever be the real nature of these references, whether they refer to one Pallava Nandivarman or to several, such as Simha Vishṇu, Paramēśvaravarman and Nandivarman (in fact, all the Vaishṇava Pallavas), it is *clear that we have to look for the date of the Āḻvār while the Pallavas were still in power and the Chōḻas had not come into prominence.*

There is one reference, however, which should give us a narrow enough limit for his time, and that is, in the last stanza of the decad immediately preceding that just considered. In celebrating the shrine of Ashṭabhujakaram in Kānchi, he makes what, in his case, appears as a somewhat peculiar reference to a certain *Vairamēghan* '*bowed down to by the ruler of the people of the Toṇḍa country, whose army (or strength) surrounded Kānchi.*' In all references made to rulers, he has been specifying people who had made special donations to Vishṇu, whether with respect to Chidambaram, Triplicane or Tirunaraiyūr. In this case alone is the reference made in a secular fashion. Besides, the language indicating the connection would warrant the inference that the reference is made to a living person. In the commentary of Periya Āchchan Pillai, Vairamēghan is explained by the term *Chakravarti* (emperor). Thus it is clear that at the time referred to, there was a Pallava ruler who was under the protection of an imperial personage

whose name (or rather title) was Vairamēghan. This again warrants the inference of the decline of the Pallava power.

Among the inscriptions so far brought out, we have not often come across the name, but the *Rāshṭrakūṭa Dantidurga II* of the genealogical table of the family, in Fleet's *Kannaḍa Dynasties*, is given this name from the Kaḍaba Plates published by Mr. Rice.* This was the personage who overthrew the natural enemies of the Pallavas, *viz.*, the Western Chāḷukyas of Baḍāmi, and in their stead established the Rāshṭrakūṭa power. According to the Ellora Inscription referred to by Dr. Fleet,† "Dantidurga completed the acquisition of sovereignty by subjugating the ruler of Sandhuhbūpa (?), the lord of Kānchi, the rulers of Kalinga and Kōsala, the lord of the Śrīśaila country (Karṅūl Country), the Sēshas (?), and the kings of Māḷava, Laṭa and Taṇka (?)." This Dantidurga was deposed by his uncle Krishṇa I, about *A.D. 755.* The king of Kānchi (during the period including A.D. 754, the only known date for Dantidurga Vairamēgha) was *Nandivarman* who ruled for fifty years from about A.D. 710.‡ He is regarded as a usurper and is so far *the last great Pallava ruler known in South Indian History.* It is highly probable that when the Chāḷukya power was overthrown, the Pallavas advanced in the direction of Karnūl. The *Rāshṭrakūṭa records, therefore, together with the statement of the Āḻvār, would lead us to believe that*

* *Epigraphia Carnataka*, Gb. 61, Vol. XI., Tumkūr.

† *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. I, Pt. II. p. 389.

‡ *Śeṅ Tamil*, Vol. I, p. 80.

Dantidurga beat back the enemy and was in occupation of Kānchi. Nandivarman was a Vaishṇava, and Tirumangai Āḻvār's praise of him is admissible as that of a brother devotee, but any reference by him to an enemy would be far from complimentary. Hence, it could only have been made in the manner in which it is, under circumstances when he could not get out of an unpleasant reminiscence such as the above. An inference, therefore, seems to be warranted that the Āḻvār flourished in this period exactly, and it would certainly be in keeping with the most cherished tradition of the Vaishṇavas that the arrangement made by the Āḻvār for the recital of the *Tiruvāymoḻi* of Namm Āḻvār had fallen into desuetude in the days of Nādhamuni and he had to revive it at Śrīrangam after much ado. *The date of Tirumangai Āḻvār then has to be allotted to the earlier half of the eighth century of the Christian era.*

We have now to dispose of *another Vaishṇava tradition* which has often proved a red herring across the path of many a Śaiva scholar of repute, and made him lose his balance of mind. It is the story *that Tirumangai Āḻvār held a successful disputation with the Śaiva sage Tirugñānasambandar.* It does not concern us here to examine whether the disputation was successful to the Vaishṇava or the Śaiva ; but our only business is to examine whether the two could have been contemporaries. A late revered Śaiva scholar, in a letter to a friend of mine, who enquired if there was anything to warrant this, promptly wrote back to say that it was "as false as any Vaishṇava tradition." If Sambanda paid a visit to the man who

destroyed Badāmi in A.D. 642, it might have taken place about the end of the seventh century, and so, if Tirumangai Āḻvār had been at the height of his religious devotion about the middle of the eighth century, it is possible they were contemporary. Besides, they were both natives of the same place nearly ; the Śaiva was born at Shiyāḻi, and the Vaishṇava at a village not far off. The dispute is said to have taken a curious form. It was not a religious question, but was only one of title to ability in composing poetry. The Āḻvār's disciples went about shouting "here comes *nālukaviperumāḷ* (he that excels in composing the four kinds of poetry)." The Aḍiyār's disciples objected and ushered the Āḻvār to their preceptor's presence. The Āḻvār was asked to compose a *kuṟaḷ*, and burst out with a decad in praise of Śrī Rāma of Shiyāḻi, beginning with "*Orukuṟaḷ*" (unparallelled dwarf), a sense entirely different to that which the Aḍiyār would have given to the word. The story further goes on to state that Sambanda was satisfied and not only acquiesced in the titles of the Āḻvār, but even made him a present of the trident he used to carry. It is of no use to enter into the details of the story, as, so far, it has merely led to annoyance, but one particular, however, cannot be passed over here. And that is, that the Āḻvār, who generally gives himself one of the titles in the concluding stanza of each decad, breaks out at the end of this one into a rather provoking and assertive enumeration of all of them.

It would appear, therefore, after all has been said, that tradition combined with the result of the historical research, as far as it bears upon the subject, would *allot*

Tirumangai Āḻvār to the earlier half of the 8th century after Christ; and thus possibly he was a younger contemporary of Tirugñānasambandar, and perhaps an elder of Sundaramūrti Nāyanār.

[*Reprinted from the Indian Antiquary,*
Vol. XXXV. 288–293.]

Tirumangai Alvar and Danti Durga.

Under this heading, my friend, Mr. K. G. Sesha Ayyar, of Trivandrum, deals in Vol. XI, No. 4, of the Mythic Society's Journal with the question of Tirumangai Āḻvār and his date. The article is essentially one devoted to a criticism of one of my papers on the subject and that of Pandit M. Raghava Ayyangar in the 'Śeṅ Tamil'. These articles were originally written about fifteen years ago and that they should come in for critical reconsideration now shows the sustained interest of the learned judge in the particular question.

The first part of my friend's article quotes two lines of a stanza of Tirumangai Āḻvār and makes two or three extracts from the article of that name from "Ancient India" and arrives at the conclusion "If Mr. Krishnasvami Ayyangar's interpretation of the passage be accepted, his conclusion may, perhaps, follow; but is his interpretation correct?"

Without considering for the present the charitable implications of the opening sentence of the next paragraph, "I venture to say, with all respect to the distinguished scholar, that he has, in his zeal for historic research, read into the passage meaning not intended by the poet", we

shall pass on to a consideration of the point at issue. The whole stanza reads thus :—

மன்னவன் தொண்டையர்கோன் வணங்கு
நீள்முடிமாலைவயிரமேகன்
தன்வலி தன் புகழ்சூழ்ந்த கச்சியட்டபுயகரத்தாதிதன்னை
கன்னிநன்மாமதிள்மங்கைவேந்தன் காமருசீர்
கலிகன்றிகுன்றா
வின்னிசையால் சொன்ன செஞ்சொல்மாலை
யேத்தவல்லார்க்கிடம் வைகுந்தமே.

The object of the Āḻvār is the celebration of the aspect of Vishṇu as he is supposed to exhibit himself in the image in the particular shrine Ashṭabhujakaram in Kānchi. Mr. Sesha Ayyar devotes the whole of that paragraph to what he considers is my meaning and arrives at the solemn conclusion "I honestly believe that the meaning attributed to the Tamil couplet is forced or unnatural, and it cannot be accepted." He adds emphasis to this dictum by following it up with, "and I do so, even though I know Pandit M. Raghava Ayyangar has explained it exactly in the same way".

The first point calling for remark in this connection is that the Āḻvār means celebrating Vishṇu, not the Pallava or the Rāshṭrakūta who figures there; they figure only as mere accessories. If the forces and the fame of the Rāshṭrakūta lay around Kānchi, it need not necessarily follow, having regard to the fact that the Āḻvār introduces him in connection with this particular shrine that this must be in any humiliation of the Pallava. We shall come to that point a little later. Let us first see what the meaning

of the passage actually is. The last two lines merely state that those who could recite in prayer stanzas that the Āḻvār sang in praise of this shrine will inevitably go to heaven. That does not therefore concern the discussion. The object of his celebration is Vishṇu who shows himself in the particular shrine of Ashṭabhujakaram of Kānchi. As Mr Sesha Ayyar himself has accepted, it falls into two parallel statements accepting for the while Mr. Sesha Ayyar's interpretation. This may be written categorically one after the other for the sake of comparison, The first statement as is shown above taking the last word '*mālai*' as the accusative of the Tamil word '*māl*', the equivalent of Vishṇu, would mean Vishṇu of the long crown receiving the worshipful deference of the King who is ruler over the Toṇḍaiyar, people of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam. The second says similarly, the first being in Ashṭabhujakaram in Kānchi was surrounded by the forces and the fame of Vairamēgha. Mr. Sesha Ayyar obviously wants Vairamēghan to be equated with the Pallava king of the first statement. This involves a phenominally unusual construction. To begin with, there would be no sense unless *nīḷ-muḍi-māl*, the accusative in the first statement be equated with Ashṭapuyakarattu Ādi, the accusative in the second statement to make the lines agree with the following two lines. That is all right so far. What would be the propriety of the Āḻvār stating in the first case that the Pallava king was in the habit of worshipping Vishṇu, and in the second the same Pallava's forces were lying around Kānchi if Vairamēghan and Toṇḍaiyarkōn were one and the same person? I believe it would be difficult to quote an instance from this Āḻvār or, for the matter of that, from

any other of similar consideration involving the same implications. Mr. Sesha Ayyar makes the grievous mistake of imagining that the Aḻvār's object was either to praise the Pallava king or hold him up to contempt, to celebrate Vairamēghan or to humiliate his contemporary Pallava. Even where the Āḻvār makes reference to earthly rulers in this or any other poem he brings them in only as accessories without any motive to praise them as such. All the praise that from his point of view he could bestow upon them is merely the greatest praise that he could give to them as devotees of Vishṇu. If we divest ourselves of the idea that the Āḻvār has any motive to praise the one ruler or the other, the position gets to be made clear. It is Vishṇu in Aṭṭapuyakaram, who on the one hand receives the habitual worship of the Pallava king, and who on the other hand received some kind of worship from Vairamēghan whose fame and forces at the time lay around Kānchi. What there is unnatural in it is more than one can understand. If at one time Danti Durga Vairamēgha invaded Kānchi and remained for some time there in a position of hostility to the ruler of Kānchi, it would still be possible for him to pay his worship at a shrine of the reputation of Ashṭabhujakaram in Kānchi. In such a case the Āḻvār is merely describing what actually did happen without any reflection whatsoever of his own, one way or another, that the ruler of Kānchi was standing deferentially by the foreigner over-lord for the time being. It therefore seems reasonable that we shall have to regard the Pallava ruler and Vairamēghan as two separate entities whether their relations were friendly or hostile; and in this interpretation of the Tamil passage we have the support not only of Pandit Raghava Ayyangar but

of several other Pandits and scholars, and unless we have badly forgotten, of Pandit Mahamahopadhyaya Swaminatha Ayyar himself who has no doubt that the personages under reference in that particular stanaza of the poem *are two, not one*. We have no quarrel with Mr. Sesha Ayyar holding his own opinion; but we feel bound to say that we cannot agree with him that the "meaning attributed to the Tamil couplet is forced or unnatural, and it cannot be accepted". We are not prepared to subscribe to the pontifical authority, whether it was actually meant or no, that the statement claims. The Āḻvār states plainly that these stanzas are devoted to the praise of Vishṇu in *Aṭṭapuyakaram* who habitually receives the worship of the Pallava king and who on one occasion received the worship of a ruler Vairamēghan whose fame and forces lay around Kānchi at the time. We disclaim any anxiety in our research as we do not do it in a holiday excursion, and are not anxious as to what the results are. They are what they are; the results of our own study and of our own understanding either of which it is but human if it proved to be imperfect. But in this case we might claim that we are more or less certain of our ground.

Coming to the general historical consideration, we need hardly repeat that all that is known of the Āḻvār traditionally and otherwise indicate an age which does not differ widely from what this specific datum would lead us to. The difficulty about accepting the equation of Vairamēghan as a Pallava king is this. The equation, if not positively unsound grammatically, is unsound according to every canon of literary interpretation. We know of

no Vairamēghan as a name or title of any Pallava sovereign, of whom we know as many as 35 to 40 before the days of the great Nandi. For the title Vairamēghan to be assumed by the successors of Nandi there is a specific reason not unconnected with the point we are discussing. Mr. Sesha Ayyar dismisses this important consideration with "however the name originated, it is not improbable as the commentator says that it was the family name of the Pallava rulers of Kānchi ; and Danti Durga in the flush of his short-lived victory or ascendency over perhaps Nandi Varman, adopted the title of the conquered foe. I see no reason for holding that Danti Durga was the first in history to assume the name or title of Vairamēgha". If these are all the reasons that Mr. Sesha Ayyar can adduce in support of his position, we regret very much to have to confess that we shall still continue unconvinced. We have a number of elaborate royal charters issued manifestly from the Pallava royal archives which give a long recital of the names and titles of the successive Pallava rulers and none of these happen to mention Vairamēgha. With all deference to the commentator Periyavāchchān Piḷḷai we are doing him no disrespect when we say that his chief strength was not history. In this particular he does not come up to the level either of Parimēlazhahar or of Aḍiyārkkunallār, nor even of Nachchinārkkiniyar. It is a very sorry argument to use in discussions like this that a particular thing might have been this or might have been that. We would, with the greatest pleasure, accept an adverse argument if it should only be a little more precise.

Where does the improbability or much less the impossibility come in of the Āḻvār referring to the Rāshṭrakūṭa

ruler? The Chāḷukyas and the Pallavas were inveterate and unceasing enemies. The Rāshṭrakūṭa Danti Durga successfully subverted the former dynasty. The great Pallava Nandi was in his turn a usurper and occupied the Pallava throne after overturning possibly the legitimate dynasty. Could not the two have been in alliance? Even after having come into hostile contact for once, is it not possible historically, nay, very highly probable that the Rāshṭrakūṭa undertook an invasion of Kānchi soon after the successful subversion of his rivals at home? It is not likely in the political circumstances of Nandi that he offered resistance in the first instance and accepted a reasonable treaty of alliance having regard to the uncertainty of his own political position? Does not the Āḻvār's statement reflect just the state of things in the peem if it is carefully and dispassionately read? It was Nandi's son in the Pallava list who first assumes the name Danti or Danti Varma. We know of no Pallava Danti Varma before. Whence was that name? Does not M. Dubreuil, whom Mr. Sesha Ayyar quotes with approval, say that the two rulers entered into a marriage alliance, that Nandi married a daughter of the Rāshṭrakūṭa Danti Durga? Is not the 6th ślōka* which I set down here for reference of the Vēlūrpāḷayam plates the best commentary on this particular point, where the ślōka makes a clear implication of the Rāshṭrakūṭa parentage of the Queen Rēva through whom Nandi had the son Danti?

It is hardly necessary to carry the argument any further except to point out that the reference to Chakravarti

* Tasyāmburāśēriva vāhinīnāmnāthasya nānāguṇaratna dhāmnaḥ.
Dhīrasya bhūbhṛdvaralabdhajanmā Rēvēva Rēvā mahishī babhūva.

by Periyavāchchān Piḷḷai is an illuminating indication that even he did understand Vairamēghan to be in some sense an over-lord of the Pallava. The Vaishṇavas knew of only one Toṇḍamān Chakravarti whom they drag in for anything of interest in that line.

With the knowledge that we now have of the statement in the Vēlūrpāḷayam plates regarding the political and domestic alliance between Nandi Varma of Kānchi and Danti Durga, the position we had taken up grows only stronger and the incongruity that Mr. Sesha Ayyar would see in the praise of the foreign Rāshṭrakūṭa by the Āḻvār grows the feebler. It is now possible to take it that both Nandi Varma and Danti Durga stood before the God of the shrine in the position of son-in-law and father-in-law, and the deferential attitude of the Pallava indicated in the verse may be explained as nothing more than the courtesy due to this particular relationship. We have no hesitation therefore in asserting our belief, reinforced by this new circumstance which was not before us at the time that the original article was written, that the verse under consideration has reference to two rulers, the local Pallava ruler of Kānchi and the foreign Rāshṭrakūṭa Vairamēgha, the former enemy and perhaps at the time the friendly ally and father-in-law of Nandi Varman, the Pallava. We would invite attention to the tenses used by the Āḻvār in regard to the incomplete verbs that occur in the first two lines of the sentence. We may take occasion here to refer to another possible objection, raised by another friend of ours, that the term *nīḷ-muḍi* is generally used as an attribute of Vishṇu, not of earthly monarchs. We would merely invite

the attention of our friend to stanza 9 of the 8th section of the fifth ten of the same Āḻvār's works where the same expression is used attributively of a Pallava sovereign whose identity has not yet been made clear. It is also possible to argue if the Āḻvār was stating in the first line of the stanza under discussion that the Pallava worshipped Vishṇu, it is not likely that he would have referred to the long crown but much rather to the lotus feet of Vishṇu. We still hold that the stanza means that Vishṇu at Ashṭabhujakaram was worshipped 'on one occasion' by Vairamēgha whose fame and forces lay around Kānchi at the time, and was held in deferential esteem habitually by the King, the ruler of the Pallavas. We pass over Mr. Sesha Ayyar's remark regarding Toṇḍaimaṇḍaḷam, Tiraiyan and the Nāga connection of the Pallavas, points well-known but irrelevant to the question.

Mr. Sesha Ayyar having disposed of this particular point, turns his attention to the ten of Paramēśvara Viṇṇagaram, another shrine of Kānchi. We are implicated, of course, in the reference; since Pandit Raghava Ayyangar has made more detailed reference to it in his article. Mr. Sesha Ayyar's attention is all devoted to him. It is hardly necessary to traverse the whole series of his arguments. The shrine is called Paramēśvara Viṇṇaharam and was built apparently in honour of a Paramēśvara Varma. The halting character of our view in regard to this ten of the Āḻvār is due to the fact that the battles were not all of them identifiable to our satisfaction; that we entertain some doubt whether the shrine had reference to the first or the second Paramēśvara and whether Nandi Varman, if he

was a usurper, was likely to have constructed a shrine in honour of a rival overthrown or one of his predecessors. Pandit Raghava Ayyangar certainly went ahead and tried to identify the incidents in the ten with what was known of the achievements of Nandi Varma's general Udaya Chandra. In regard to Mr. Sesha Ayyar's criticism of Mr. Raghava Ayyangar we only point out that it is not such an impossible feat that the general's victories are ascribed to the King. That there is, to begin with, the traditional comment that *a Pallava and a Chōḻa* made some dedications to the temple and the Āḻvār is said to be referring to them. *That* is only tradition so far. But still it raises the presumption whether it is not one Pallava that is under reference in the whole of the ten stanzas. Again Mr. Sesha Ayyar's contention is that all that is ascribed here to the Pallava should be found in the Udayēndram plates among the achievements of Udaya Chandra even including his two campaigns. Where is the necessity for it? If Udaya Chandra's campaigns have reference to the early campaigns of the reign of Nandi Varma for which there is some historical justification, and if the Āḻvār came rather late in the reign of Nandi it would be readily possible for the Āḻvār to mention incidents which do not find reference in the achievements of his general. This possibility must be taken into consideration in the kind of criticism that Mr. Sesha Ayyar has undertaken of the Pandit's position. Mr, Sesha Ayyar again tries to make a little too much of the occurrence of expressions like *paṇḍu* (பண்டு) and *aṅṟu* (அன்று) as necessarily referring to the remote past. It is hardly the case. References could be quoted readily for the use of *aṅṟu*

(அன்று) and *iṉṟu* (இன்று) for occurrences within the life-time of a single man. So is the case of *paṇḍu* (பண்டு). A quotation readily suggests itself in this connection in regard to this latter word.

Madhurakavi says that Nammāḻvār, who is called Kārimāran in the verse, having seen him and accepted him as his disciple, got rid of his evil-fate then and therefore "I praise the grace of Śatakōpa in order that the eight directions might know of his graciousness". The first act of grace of Nammāḻvār to Madhurakavi certainly occurred some time late in the life of Madhurakavi himself. If later in life he could have referred to this incident by the term *paṇḍu* it is hard to understand the impropriety of this term denoting a past somewhat similar in the Paramēśvara Viṇṇagaram ten. If we do not agree with Mr. Raghava Ayyangar in regard to this matter it is for reasons far other than what Mr. Sesha Ayyar has accepted in the course of his criticism. We know of two or three other specific references to personages and potentates of significance in Tirumangai Āḻvār's works. We have not expressed any opinion upon them for the simple and satisfying reason that we do not have enough materials to understand these recondite references and regret that the commentator is hardly of any service to us in this connection. We must say however that it is too much of an order that "the materials for deciding the date of the Āḻvār have, in my humble view, yet to be gathered and sifted, and as yet no definite data have been discovered to justify the opinion that we should look for the Vaishṇava Śaint in the 8th century of the Christian era." We certainly shall welcome

now, as ever before, specific data invalidating our own conclusions or leading to others, even of a contrary tendency. But we do not feel convinced by the vague argument and the faint possibilities which are all that are so far offered by Mr. Sesha Ayyar. We are grateful to him for having drawn pointed attention to the matter and we still hold, notwithstanding his great authority, that the Danti Durga datum is specific enough and that the opinion that Tirumangai Āḻvār flourished in the 8th century is founded upon a basis of fairly substantial argument.

[*Reprinted from the Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Vol. XII, 1921-22.*]

The Age of Perundevan, the Author of the Tamil Bharatam

Peruṅdēvanār is a well-known name in Tamil literature but it is not without considerable obscurity in respect of the person for whom it stands. It provides a very good illustration of the danger that lies in the way of the identifications from the mere sameness of the name. The fact that so early as the age of the Śaṅgam the need for differentiation came to be felt, and among a number of -names, one name Peruṅdēvan got singled out as the man, who put in Tamil verse *Bhāratam* (*Bhāratam-pāḍiya-Peruṅdēvanār*) is certain indication that there were already a number that went by the name. This Peruṅdēvanār's name occurs in the so-called larger Śinnamanūr plates, and that has been fastened on to equate this Peruṅdēvanār, the poet of the *Bhāratam*, with the author of the *Bhāratavenbā*. A whole system of chronology was based upon it, which on examination collapses like a house of cards. It would be worth while therefore examining how many Peruṅdēvanārs we happen to know in Tamil literature and who this Peruṅdēvanār is, whose name figures in the Pāṇḍyan Copper Plates found at Śinnamanūr.

Peruṅdēvanār is a name which occurs prominently in Tamil literature in four connections. There is one Peruṅdēvan who is described without any further attribute and

of him we have no more than two poems, poem 83 of *Naṟṟiṇai* and poem 51 of *Ahanāṉūṟu*. There is very little known of him besides the authorship of these two poems.

Another Peruṅdēvanār is referred to as one who wrote the poetical *Bhāratam* in Tamil, and a Bhāratam-pāḍiya-Peruṅdēvanār is credited with the poems in invocation of the eight collections which go under the name *Śaṅgam* collections in orthodox Tamil parlance. According to the late Pandit Narayanaswami Aiyar of Kumbhakonam, the few stanzas from this *Bhāratam* which are found quoted as illustrations in various works are in the metre of his other poems found in the *Śaṅgam* collections. Of his work *Bhāratam*, these few stanzas alone are all that we have access to at the present time. If ever we should come upon the whole work, it will certainly settle at least one very knotty problem in the chronology of Tamil literature. The poems in invocation in the various classics already referred to, have reference to Viṣṇu, Śiva, Gaṇeśa, Subrahmaṇya or Skanda etc., so that this poet does not appear to have been particularly sectarian in his views.

The third celebrity of this name is the author of what is now generally known as the *Bhāratavenbā* which makes a direct reference to a patron. This is the Pallava King Nandivarman, victor at Teḷḷāṟu, to distinguish him from other Pallava kings of the same name. It is these two that have been equated without warrant to make the existing confusion of literary chronology worse confounded.

Another celebrity of the same name is a commentator and a disciple of Buddha-Mitra, the author of the *Vīra Śōḻiyam*, a grammar of the eleventh century A.D.

According to the colophon of this work, Buddha-Mitra was the governor of Ponpaṟṟi under the Chōḻa King Vīrarājendra A. D. 1063–1070 to which his own disciple Peruṅdēvan wrote the commentary. There are other Peruṅdēvans such as Kaḍuhu Peruṅdēvan, Kavisāgara Peruṅdēvan, etc. But of them we know next to nothing to our great comfort in this connection. In regard to the last name, various lines of evidence, internal to the work and historical, leave no doubt as to his identity and to the period in which he flourished. The third one seems also to allot himself to a particular time early in the 9th century A. D. possibly in the last years of the previous century, as of Nandivarman of Teḷḷāṟu was in all probability the grandson of Nandivarman Pallavamalla, Teḷḷāṟu being a place some miles south of Tindivanam. The main question in this particular connection is whether this Peruṅdēvan, the contemporary of Nandi of Teḷḷāṟu and the author of the *Bhārata-veṇbā* is the Peruṅdēvan, the poet of the *Bhāratam*, who composed the various poems in invocation, which are included in the collections that have come down to us of the *Śaṅgam* classics. In order to settle this question, it will not do to put the cart before the horse, as has been done too often with considerable show of authority. Here are two distinct entities which have to be equated, and one would expect some kind of lead before one takes the responsibility of proposing the identity. There are some considerations which have to be weighed before even the possibility of this identification is suggested. Who is this Peruṅdēvan ? And why is it that he makes the poems in invocation ? Poems in invocation are made usually at the time the collection is made, unless a commentary gets to be written and perhaps then the

commentator makes it. In this case the occurrence of a stanza ascribed to him in the compilation known as the *Tiruvaḷḷuva Mālai*, puts him according to orthodox Tamil opinion, on the same footing as the authors of the *Śaṅgam* classics whose names also figure there. That gives us the ulterior limit of his age, as the age when the *Kuṛaḷ* received the *Śaṅgam imprimatur* under one Ugra Pāṇḍyan according to tradition. The *Ainguṛunūṛu* collection was made by one Kūḍalūr Kiḻār for his Patron, the Cēra, who is distinguished as the Cēra "of the elephant look" (Yānaikkaṭ-cēy-Māndaram-Śēral Irumporai). It is this poet that mourned the death of this Cēra in poem 229 of the *Puṛanānūṛu* collection. So then it is clear, this collection was made in the reign of the Cēra of the elephant look." We have shown elsewhere (vide *Beginnings of South Indian History*, Chap. VI) that the contemporary Pāṇḍya of this prince was the Pāṇḍyan, victor at Talaiyālangānam. So far then at least as the one collection *Ainguṛunūṛu* is concerned, it is clear that the collection was made at the time when the Cēra "of the elephant look" and the Pāṇḍyan, "Victor at Talaiyālangānam" lived. Another important collection, which, according to the colophon of the work (as yet unpublished) says that the collection was made for a Pāṇḍya king by name Ugra Pāṇḍyan by a Brahman Rudraśarman, son of Uppūrikkuḍi-Kiḻān, resident of Madura. There is a tradition connecting this Rudraśarman with the commentary on the *Iraiyanār Ahapporuḷ* of Nakkīrar. The story is briefly as follows : a number of commentators set to work to comment upon this abbreviated grammar and someone was wanted, who could express an authoritative opinion as to which of the commentaries has the approval of authorised usage.

In the absence of anybody else, this Rudraśarman, a dumb child of five, was indicated by no less an authority than God Śiva himself the supposed author of the work. The story goes on to say that it was only two commentaries that stood this test. The commentary by Marudan Iḷanāgan received occasional approval, while that by Nakkīrar received unqualified approval throughout. Thus then the tradition connects this Rudraśarman as a young contemporary of Nakkīrar and Iḷanāgan both of them, contemporaries of the Pāṇḍyan of Talaiyālangānam, whom they celebrated in a number of poems ascribed to them, and forming part of *Puṛanānūṛu*, *Ahanānūṛu* and works of that connection. So this tradition takes us back to the collection of the *Ahanānūṛu* either in the reign of the Pāṇḍyan at Talaiyālangānam himself, or to a successor immediately following him, whom we shall have to call, according to this, Ugra Pāṇḍyan in whose time the *Ahanānūṛu* collection was made.

According to the traditional account of the *Śaṅgam* as embodied in the *Iraiyanār Ahapporuḷ* and by the commentator of the *Śilappadhikāram*, those monarchs, who took an active part in the third *Śaṅgam* were the line of rulers beginning with Muḍattirumāṛan, who lived at the time of the floods to Ugrapperuvaḻudi (the great Pāṇḍya Ugra). We have on a former occasion (vide the Augustan Age of Tamil Literature in Ancient India) indicated that this Ugra Pāṇḍyan must be the same as the Pāṇḍyan, victor over the Āryan army, whose name figures in the *Śilappadhikāram* for the reason that, as both the *Śilappadhikāram* and *Maṇimēkhalai* quote from the *Kuṛaḷ* even with

acknowledgment, the Ugra Pāṇḍyan before whom the *Kuṛaḷ* received the Śaṅgam imprimatur must be one at least slightly anterior to them. The other reasons I have given in some fullness in my *Augustan Age of Tamil Literature.* This seems to find some confirmation from the fact that Nakkīrar's commentary on the *Iraiyanār Ahapporuḷ* as it is handed down to us, contains a number of quotations from the *Kuṛaḷ.* We shall probe this question further before we either give up this identification or postulate a second Ugra Pāṇḍyan. That Ugra Pāṇḍyan, the contemporary of Rudraśarman in whose court the *Ahanānūṛu* collection was made, was slightly posterior to the Pāṇḍyan of Talaiyālangānam is the point that we are making out just now. It is this battle of Talaiyālangānam, the translation of the *Mahābhāratam* and the establishing of the *Śaṅgam* that are brought into connection in the Śinnamanūr plates. This connection has led to the inferences referred to at the very beginning of this essay. The late Mr. Venkayya in his report for 1907 says: 'a few of the facts mentioned in the Tamil portion of the Śinnamanūr plates are of very great importance to the student of Tamil literature, namely the victory at Talaiyālangānam, the translation of the *Mahābhārata* into Tamil and the establishment of the college of poets at Madura. Though mentioned along with events of a more or less mythical character, these three facts must be historical and have to be treated as such. According to Tamil literature the victory at Talaiyālangānam was achieved by a Pāṇḍya king named Neḍumśeḻiyan against two kings and five tributary chiefs. This victory was considered such an important event of his reign that the attribute " who gained

the battle at Talaiyālangānam" became attached to his name in later times. It is perhaps an accident that these three facts are mentioned together and at the end of the long list of achievements of Pāṇḍya kings. We have no reason to suppose that the events are mentioned in chronological order or that the three last took place in one and the same reign. There is a tradition that Peruṅdēvanār, who composed the Tamil *Bhāratavenbā* was one of the poets of the last Madura College (*Kaḍaichchaṅgam* in Tamil). If there is any truth in this tradition, the reference to the Tamil translation of the *Mahābhārata* made in the larger Śinnamanūr plates may be his work. *But Peruṅdēvanār refers as his patron to a Pallava King, who defeated his enemies at* Teḷḷāṟu (Annual Report for 1898–99, paragraph 16). If this Pallava king is identical with the Nandippōttaraiyar "who defealed his enemies at Teḷḷāru" and whose inscriptions have been found in the Tamil country, Peruṅdēvanār must belong to the second half of the 8th century. And if it is to this translation of the *Mahābhārata*, contained in the *Bhāratavenbā* that the Śinnamanūr plates refer, there is no apparent reason why the achievement is assigned to Pāṇḍya kings who had passed away before the first historical person mentioned in the genealogy. It is just possible that the events took place during the reign of some king or kings, whose names the composer of the inscription deliberately wished to avoid mentioning. In support of this conjecture we have no evidence at all at present and it must therefore be supposed, at least provisionally, *that the Tamil translation of the Mahābhārata here referred to is earlier than Peruṅdēvanār's version.* The foundation of the Tamil

Śaṅgam at Madura is the last of the three achievements and refers probably to what is known in Tamil literature as the third Śaṅgam (*Kaḍaichchaṅgam*). If the date assigned in the sequel for Arikēsarin Māravarman is correct, the last Madura College must have come into existence prior to the middle of the 8th century A. D."

Neither in his report nor in the one for the following year he submitted to the Government did Mr. Venkayya pursue the matter further to its legitimate conclusion, as to when exactly and where we are entitled to look for the Pāṇḍya who did these glorious things. We examined the whole question in some detail in the *Biginnings of the South Indian History* in Chapter VI, sections 2 and 3, and have found that for the Pāṇḍya who instituted the Śaṅgam, we have to go back very early, as indeed the inscriptional reference does actually give us a hint in this direction. The expression used there is that these events took place in the remote past, which indeed would actually warrant more than the inference that the *Śaṅgam* must have taken place before the 8th century. The *Śaṅgam* as such finds reference in Sundaramūrti Nāyanār's *Tiruttoṇḍattogai* in connection with Kulachirai. Tirumangai Āḻvār has a couple of references where he speaks of his own poem as composed in the Tamil of the *Śaṅgam*. The more modern stanzas in the *Iraiyanār Ahapporuḷ* do contain in stanza 167 a reference to the Śaṅgam, not as such but in other words. So that the inference is that it was much anterior to the writer of these stanzas. We get for that modern author who edited the *Iraiyanār Ahapporuḷ* and published it in its present form, an age ten generations on this side of the *Talaiyālangā-nattu* Pāṇḍyan, but earlier than those referred to in the

Śinnamanūr plates as we have shown good reason for thinking so. Then we shall have to give a little more than 300 years from the earliest Pāṇḍyan that figures in these copper plates for the age of the *Talaiyālangānattu* Pāṇḍyan. Therefore the reference that joins in one statement the victory at Talaiyālangānam, the translation of the *Mahābhāratam*, and the establishment of the Śaṅgam must be taken as having relation to a particular Pāṇḍyan, and that it seems to us undoubtedly to be a reference to the Pāṇḍyan of Talaiyālangānam, the contemporary and friend of Nakkīrar. This would agree very well with what we have already said of the collection of some of the *Śaṅgam* works, particularly the *Ahanānūṛu* and *Ainguṛunūṛu* for which Peruṅdēvanār made the poems in invocation. Therefore then Peruṅdēvanār of the *Bhāratam* has to be referred to an age which may be slightly later, but which may appropriately be called the age of the Pāṇḍyan, victor at Talaiyālangānam. This Peruṅdēvanār and the author of the *Bhāratavenbā* were separated from each other by an interval of time which may roughly be put down at about 4 centuries, and therefore the two cannot be identified with each other and must be regarded as two distinct entities in Tamil literature.

This conclusion is at variance with those of others who regard the Gajabāhu synchronism discredited, and would pin their faith to the so-called astronomical argument. This last in various forms turns round upon two points; (i) the names of the week-days beginning with Sunday is given a Christian origin, and the introduction of the week must have been later than Constantine's edict; (ii) the names of the signs of the Zodiac are given in certain astronomical,

or astrological works, in their Greek names. In regard to these two points, I need say no more in this connection, than to point out that neither of these positions has been proved. No direct evidence of borrowing has been offered in regard to the first, nor that it had an astronomical origin at all. In regard to the second the fact that Varāha Mihira lays himself out to give the Greek names separately while all through the work he uses the Indianised names is clear proof that he did not regard the Indian names as borrowed. Other details of scientific astronomy are irrelevant to the point at issue. It is hardly necessary that if there is borrowing it should be in whole and not in parts. The following remarks of Professor Vogel seem to the point :—

" We find the Zodiac sings indicated by names either corresponding to the Greek, or by actual Greek apellations in Sanskritised form. Thus we have *Kriya* from Greek Krios (Aries), Tavuri (Tauros), Jituma from Diduma (Gemini) and so on. The names of the Planets shew the same peculiarity. Heli from Greek Helios (the Sun), Himna from Greek Hermes (Mercury); Ara from Greek Ares (Mars). I may note that the alternative Indian apellations which correspond to the Greek only in form were probably not borrowed from Greece, but had a common Babylonian origin. This explains why the days of the week in India as well as in Europe are named after the Sun, the Moon and the five planets. " *

[*Reprinted from the Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute, 1921–22.*]

---

* Professor J. Ph. Vogel, Greek influence on Ancient Indian Civilisation, East and West for January 1912; p. 40.

A School of South Indian Buddhism in Kanchi

1. Kānchi, the Conjivaram of Anglo-Indian usage, has been within historic times the capital of the country known to outsiders as Drāviḍa. Drāviḍa, though in its origin applicable to all the Tamil land, has become confined to one division of it, the northern portion of the eastern half of the Tamil country. But the terms, Chōḷa, and Pāṇḍya were known to Kātyāyana, the author of the *Vārttikas* on Pāṇini. We have to come down to the days of Patañjali for a reference to the city of Kānchi as such. While the city may have existed, possibly under another name, the city must have acquired fame and become an important centre by the time that Patañjali settled down to writing his *Mahābhāshya*. Even in Tamil literature the three kings of the South, Cēra, Chōḷa and Pāṇḍya, seem to be the earlier and more important, while the territory dominated by Kānchi is said to have been reclaimed to civilisation by the Chōḷa King, Karikāla. Patañjali's knowledge of the South must have been fuller than that of his predecessors, as he has, at any rate, one note on the usage of the South in respect of Sanskrit terms.* We may

* Where he refers to the term *Sarasi* being used for large lakes. *Mahābhāshya*, I. i. p. 19. *Bom. Gaz.*, I. i. p. 140. Bhandarkar—*Dakhan*.

therefore, take it that Kānchi was a place of importance in the South in the age of Patañjali. The body of Tamil literature, called the Śaṅgam works collectively, have references to Kānchi, and we know of chiefs who held rule there. There are one or two poems which refer to that city, and describe it elaborately. The best known among them is the *Perumbāṇāṟṟuppaḍai*, a poem composed with the set object of praising the liberality of the chief who ruled over Kānchi at the time, Toṇḍaman Iḷam Tiraiyan. The Tamil *kāvya Maṇimēkhalai* devotes one whole section to it, and describes certain features of the city not referred to in other works. At the time to which the description in *Maṇimēkhalai* has reference, the ruler of Kānchi was a Chōḻa monarch, who is known by the royal designation Neḍumuḍik-kiḷḷi, that is, 'the Kiḷḷi of the High Crown.' He came to the throne in succession to the great Chōḻa, Karikāla, either immediately after, as in all probability was actually the case, or in the second generation, and the first chief of importance is one described as Toṇḍamān, the great one among the Toṇḍaiyar, and Iḷam Tiraiyan, Tiraiyan the younger, involving by implication that there was an older Tiraiyan. There is one such known in this body of literature called, without any modifying adjunct, Tiraiyan, associated with the territory of the Toṇḍaiyar, with a town called Pavattiri.* Pavattiri probably was the capital of the Toṇḍaiyar at the time, whose chief hill is described as

* Pavattiri known in later inscriptions is 'Pavattiri that had been swallowed up by the sea.' The modern village Reḍḍipāḷem in the Gūḍūr Taluq is described in inscriptions as 'Kākandi in Kaḍalkoṇḍa Pavattiri.' Kākandi, it must be noted, was the old name by which Kāvērippaṭṭinam itself was known (Nellore Ins., I, pp. 443, 446; Ins. 87—105.)

Vēngaḍam (modern Tirupati). It is apparently to distinguish him from this Tıraiyan that the other is given the attribute 'the younger'. Iḷam Tiraiyan as ruler of Kānchi seems to have followed the Kiḷḷi referred to above. In general terms, Kānchi is described as a place of very considerable importance, containing a fort, a palace, and a number of temples, of which one Vishṇu shrine is specifically mentioned by name, *Bauddha Vihāras* and so on.

2. Kānchi figures as the capital city of that region in the earliest Pallava charters known to us. In the inscriptions of the Kadambas of Baṇavāsi across on the western side of the peninsula, the founder, Mayūraśarman, is said to have gone to Kānchi to complete his Vedic studies. It is perhaps this reputation of the city as a seat of learning that is responsible for the later Pallava charters on copper plates describing it as a *ghaṭika* of the Brahmans. In the period of the great Pallavas for which we have a vast amount of information in the Pallava charters themselves, it maintained that reputation. Most of the temples in the city came into existence in this age, and if several of them were in existence before, they received considerable addition and elaboration so that we might date the existing buildings to the age of the Pallavas, except in a few cases. The association of Bhāravi and Daṇḍin with Kānchi, which we find stated in a recently discovered Sanskrit work, *Avantisundarīkathāsāra*, ascribed to Daṇḍin, seems to have some justification.* These two poets aro said there to have

* This is confirmed in the orignal *Kathā* with a change of one detail that Daṇḍin was the great-grandson of a contemporary of Bhāravi, Dāmōdara by name, not of Bhāravi himself (*vide* Pandit Harihara Sastri's paper among the summaries, No. 20, pp. 44-7).

been related to each other as great-grandfather and great-grandson and are said to have come into Kānchi from the region of what is now Gujarat. They resided in the courts of Simhavishṇu and Rājasimha respectively. In fact Daṇḍin is said to have been tutor to the Pallava prince Rājasimha, according to one reading, at any rate, of the *Kāvyādarśa*. It undoubtedly was a great centre of Sanskrit learning, and it maintains that position to some extent even now, the only other place that challenged its eminence in this direction in some periods of history being Śrīrangam in the south.

3. In Buddhist history and Jain tradition alike Kānchi figures as an important centre of Buddhism as well. The *kāvya Maṇimēkhalai* contains an elaborate description of, at any rate, one Buddhist establishment which existed in the city to which the Chōḻa ruler referred to above made vast additions. In the itinerary of Hiuen Tsang there are references to parts of the city sacred to Buddha. It is here as a great Buddhist centre that the Jain teacher Akaḷaṅka held a disputation and destroyed Buddhist heresy.* Diṅnāga was born in the Simhavaktra gate of the city, and Dharmapāla was similarly prince of Kānchi. At the time of the *kāvya Maṇimēkhalai*, Kānchi happened to be for some time the residence of the great Budddist divine and teacher Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ, the highest authority in the Tamil land for the orthodox teaching of the Buddha. It is in connection with him that Kānchi is brought into reference in *Maṇimēkhalai*.

---

* Epitaph on Malli Sēna, *Epi. Ind.*, Vol. III, pp. 186 and 189.
J. Bo. Br. R.A.S., XVIII, p. 213 ff.
Fleet—*Bom. Gaz.* I. ii, p. 407.

4. Maṇimēkhalai, the heroine, was the daughter of a very comely dancing woman Mādhavi. She was the child of a rich merchant's son, who, owing to his devotion to Mādhavi, the mother, practically lost all his wealth, and, in a moment of contrition, resolved to go away from the place to Madura with a view to rehabilitating himself by setting up as a merchant there. His one difficulty was want of capital. His chaste wife, Kaṇṇaki, offered to part with the only one of her costly jewels yet left with her for the purpose. The husband and the wife started on their journey unknown to others of the family even and reached Madura. In an attempt to sell the jewel, he was shown up as being in possession of stolen property, and the jewel was readily taken to be that which the queen of Madura had lost recently. He was ordered to be put to death, and the jewel recovered, by the hasty monarch. The chaste wife called upon the gods to burn the city, and having got across the borders into the Cēra country immolated herself. When news of this calamity reached Kāvērippaṭṭinam, the courtesan, whose attachment to the young merchant was real, resigned herself to a life of repentance for her contribution to this tragedy, and her young beautiful daughter who had just attained the age of maturity, similarly resolved to become a Buddhist nun. The heir-apparent of the Chōḷa ruler had already set his heart on her and attempted to take possession of her somehow, losing his life ultimately in the effort. Under the protection of her guardian-angel, the young woman passed through her trials successfully and received her initiation from Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ at Kānchi ultimately. In the course of these transactions she first of all went to a small island called Maṇipallavam near Ceylon

where, on seeing a Buddha seat of miraculous power, she learnt the history of her previous life. She returned to Kāvērippaṭṭinam and, on the advice of this Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ, she went on as a Buddhist noviciate for some time there. When the time had come for her to learn the heretical systems of religion before she was initiated into orthodox Buddhism, she proceeded to Vanji, the capital of the Cēras on the west coast. Learning all that the heretical teachers had to teach there, she ultimately came down to Kānchi, to which place Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ had already proceeded, because Kāvērippaṭṭinam had been swallowed up by the sea. She was initiated into the orthodox teaching of the Buddha and entered the Buddhist order as a nun. That is the whole story of the *kāvya*. The work actually consists of thirty separate books, each one of the books or cantos dealing with one incident in her life-story. There are three of such books devoted to her change of religion ; book 27 gives an account of the various heretical systems that prevailed at the time and a summary of what each system had to teach. Book 29 deals with her initiation into the orthodox teaching of the Buddha. Book 30 just expounds that orthodox System.

5. In the canto expounding Buddhist logic (29) Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ starts with the statement that the great Jina was 'the first being' and he recognised only two *pramāṇas*, namely, *Pratyaksha* and *Anumāna*. Other *pramāṇas* or instruments of knowledge are not valid according to him. This position is taken to be the general characteristic of Buddhism in later periods of history.*

---

* A discussion was raised on this particular point by Professor Kuppuswami Sastri of Madras and Professor Adhikari of Benares that

But the point here is that it seems to refer to the existence and recognition in other systems of the other *pramāṇas* and a critical attitude by which the rest are actually rejected as being included in the second. It is this particular attitude that is of value from the chronological point of view. Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ actually teaches this as the orthodox method according to the teaching of the Buddha himself and of nobody else. These, as far as we know, are the only two *pramāṇas* recognised by the Buddhist logician Diṅnāga whose date may now be taken to be A. D. 400. If Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ came after Diṅnāga, one may expect him to quote the authority of the great logician. The fact that he does not do so, and refers back to the actual teaching of the Buddha himself, may be taken to be evidence that this saint represents a school of teaching anterior to Diṅnāga. Diṅnāga, it will be remembered, came from Kānchi, and according to Hiuen Tsang he belonged

---

all Bauddhas accepted only two *pramāṇas*, and this particular point therefore cannot be of assistance from the point of view of chronology. The chronological importance of this particular point consists in this. There is a clear statement in the chapter on the instruments of knowledge as accepted by the Bauddhas that there were other *pramāṇas* which were rejected by the Bauddhas as being included, or at least capable of being included, in *Anumāna* itself. What were the other *pramāṇas* considered and rejected, would be a matter of interest and even of chronological value. The statement that there were ten *pramāṇas* recognised by Vyāsa, eight by Kṛtakoṭi and six by Jaimini, and their rejection are involved actually in this statement. Diṅnāga is stated to have definitely rejected *Śabda* and *Anumāna* as invalid. But here is a statement that all the others of the category, even of ten, are not exactly rejected but are regarded as superfluous, which may be an indication that Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ taught before Diṅnāga, and after Kṛtakoṭi, the Vṛttikāra.

to the *Simhavaktra* part of the city of Kānchi. The place where Aravaṇa Aḍigal taught was similarly a suburb of Kānchi at the time. The presumption, therefore, is that there was a school at Kānchi which taught this system of logic, and of which perhaps the most shining exponent was Diṅnāga. Is this position that Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ was a predecessor of Diṅnāga sustainable on the basis of the age of the *Maṇimēkhalai* itself ?

6. The *kāvya Maṇimēkhalai* is, in its subject matter, a continuation of the narrative of the *Śilappadhikāram*, as has been pointed out already. In the poems constituting the prologues and the epilogues of the work, there are references, clear and unmistakable, that the authors intended that the two books should constitute a single poem. Either poem without the other will not constitute a full epic. The authors were friends, according to Tamil tradition, and Iḷangō Aḍigaḷ, an ascetic prince, the author of the first, at any rate, refers to the author of the other poem, the grain merchant Śīttalai Śāttan of Madura, in the body of his work more than once. The former was a Cēra prince, and the latter was a grain merchant of Madura. Śāttan's name figures among the forty-nine names constituting the third academy of Madura as handed down in Tamil literary tradition. The two works, therefore, must be regarded as works contemporary with the Śaṅgam, on this basis alone, and, as a consequence, whatever was the age of the Śaṅgam, must be the period when these works were produced. A body like the Śaṅgam could have existed for generations. There is clear evidence of a brilliant epoch, the works produced in which constitute more or less the whole body

of literature known as Śaṅgam works now. That they were works of a single epoch can be proved by the internal evidence of that literature as a whole.

7. In the whole of this work there are references to Buddhism and incidents connected with Buddhist teaching. In none of these contexts do we find any allusion to the teaching of the Mādhyamika school or to its prominent exponents Nāgārjuna and Dēva. Nāgārjuna and Dēva are now recognised to have lived before A.D. 250, and the former is stated in Chinese authorities to have been a contemporary of a Śātavāhana ruler, a statement which clearly fixes them to a period somewhat anterior to A.D. 250. How is this omission to be explained? In the exposition of the various existing systems, heretical and other, this system would have found mention if Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ was opposed to it. But since Śāttan, the author, omits to mention the system prevailing in Ceylon, the same reason may have led him to omit the Mādhyamika system as well. But there is this to be said against such an assumption. The Mādhyāmika system seems to have been a system hostile to orthodox Buddhism at the time, and in the Buddhist tradition of Ceylon reference is made to prominent incidents, by way of disputation. Dēva and Nāgārjuna came into contact actually in that manner, before the former adopted the actual teaching of the latter. Having regard to the great importance of the departure made by Nāgārjuna, the omission may well be interpreted as due to non-existence; in other words, as due to Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ having taught in the Tamil country at a time earlier than Nāgārjuna. Ceylon was not altogether unknown in this work. Maṇimēkhalai

went to the island of Maṇipallavam near Ceylon, and there is reference to the footprints of the Buddha on the Samantakūṭa in Ratnadvīpa, as it is called, certainly one part of Ceylon. The absence of, or omission of the teaching of the Buddha and Buddhist divines living in the island may be because Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ may have regarded himself as belonging to the same school of orthodox teaching of the Sthaviravāda (Theravāda). The only alternative conclusion seems to be to say that the author was unaware of the existence of Buddhism in Ceylon, or that Buddhism did not exist in Ceylon, either of which would be too much to prove.

8. At the very commencement of the book dealing with heretical systems, the Vaidika *pramāṇas* are described and reference is made to three teachers of these—Vēdavyāsa, Kṛtakoṭi, and Jaimini. To these are ascribed the acceptance of ten, eight and six *pramāṇas*, respectively. The discussion winds up with the statement that the systems recognised at the time were only the well-known six, *Lokāyata*, *Bauddha*, *Sāṅkhya*, *Naiyāyika*, *Vaiśeṣika* and *Mīmāṃsā*. The respective teachers of these are recited as Bṛhaspati, Jina, Kapila, Akshapāda, Kaṇāda, and Jaimini; and the recognised *pramāṇas* at the time are given as *pratyaksha*, *anumāna*, *śabda*, *upamāna*, *arthāpatti* and *abhāva*. It must be noted here that in this recital *Mīmāṃsā* is given as a single system.

Two other peculiarities must also be noted here. Among the six systems, which according to the *Maṇimēkhalai* include *Lokāyata* and *Bauddha*, and to which the six *Vaidika pramāṇas* are applicable, will be noted the omission of two of the well-known six systems of Hindu philosophy

as distinct from the non-Brahmanical systems. They are the Yōga system of Patañjali and the Vēdānta of Vyāsa. Excluding, therefore, the two non-Brahmanical systems, and including the two above-mentioned, we get the six orthodox systems of philosophy, accepted ordinarily as such up to the days perhaps of Śaṅkarāchārya. The *Sarva-siddhānta-saṁgraha* ascribed to Śaṅkarāchārya mentions these six* systems as *Vaidika* in point of character. It, therefore, is noteworthy that the *Maṇimēkhalai*, in the first place, should exclude Yōga and Vēdānta and in the second place, that it should include *Lokāyata* and *Bauddha* among these systems. The *Sarva-siddhānta-saṁgraha* referred to above specifically mentions the *Lokāyata* of Bṛhaspati, *Ārhata* and *Bauddha* systems as opposed to the Veda, and as such hostile.† They have according to him, therefore, to be refuted by general principles of reasoning (*yukti*) as the authority of the Veda is inapplicable. In the light of this, the orthodox idea regarding these systems, it is remarkable that a professed Buddhist should include the *Bauddha* system among those to which the *Vaidika pramāṇas* are applicable. That is not all; he also includes the ostensibly atheistic *Lokāyata* in the group, and follows it up by a clear statement that these six *pramāṇas* are those in use at the time when he was writing. The only possible explanation for this seems to be that the work was written at a time when the newly formulated instruments of knowledge by Bōdhāyana were still in vogue, that even systems outside of the Veda like that of the *Lokāyata* and *Bauddha* were tested by the same kind of an organon as the more

---

**Sarva-siddhānta-saṁgraha*, Introductory Chapter, Śl. 13.

†*Ibid.*, Śl. 14.

orthodox systems, and before they narrowed themselves down to only a few of these *pramāṇas* as being applicable to their own particular system. The *Lokāyata* confined itself to *Pratyaksha* and nothing else, notwithstanding the fact that *Anumāna* was unconsciously accepted also as a means of knowledge; and the *Bauddha* had limited itself to only two, *Pratyaksha* and *Anumāna*. One other matter of consequence here is that the six recited do not include *Ārhata*, the system of the Jainas, which is dealt with separately as an independent system among those considered heretical by the Buddhists. It is discussed under the name Nirgrantha (Nikaṇḍa).

While at this subject we may as well note down the systems passed in review in this chapter of *Maṇimēkhalai*. They are (1) Vaidika, (2) Śaiva, (3) Brahmavāda, (4) Vaishṇava, (5) Veda, (6) Ājīvaka, (7) Nirgrantha, (8) Sāṅkhya, (9) Vaiśēshika, and (10) Bhūta. Though some of those may seem at first sight to be repetitions, there are minute differences between them noted, and therefore there was some justification for regarding them as separate systems. All these are not included in the sixteen systems discussed in the *Sarva-siddhānta-samgraha* of Mādhavāchārya, much less in the eleven systems included in the *Sarva-siddhānta-samgraha* of Śaṅkarāchārya. There is a set of twelve systems recited in the *Vijñānamātra Śāstra*, which is according to Professor Teitaro Suzuki of a somewhat later date than Aśvagosha.* They are (1) *Sāṅkhya*, (2) *Vaiśēshika*, (3) *Māhēśvara* (as the Creator), (4) *Mahā Brahma* (Brahma, as the Creator),

* Aśvaghōsha's *Awakening of Faith*, p. 110.

(5) *Kāla* (Time as the Creator), (6) *Space* (as the Creator), (7) *Water* (as the Creator), (8) *World* (self-created), (9) the *Quarters* (as Creator), (10) *Ego* (the principle of existence), (11) *Śabda* (immortal sound, regarded as equivalent to the *Mīmāmsā*) and (12) *Lokāyatika*. In addition to these twelve, the same Buddhist work recites the six well-known heretical teachers from the point of view of Buddhism, (1) Pūraṇa Kaśyapa, (2) Markali Gosāla, (3) Sañjaya Belaṭṭi-Putta, (4) Ajitakēśakambalin, (5) Kakuda Kātyāyana and (6) Nirgrantha Jñātiputra. Out of this list of eighteen in the *Vijñānamātra Śāstra*, it is only two which are specifically recited in the *Maṇimēkhalai* that are not discoverable, *viz*., the fourth, Vaishṇava and possibly the fifth, the Veda pure and simple, unless it is equated with (11) Śabda of this system. A comparison, therefore, of these systems may lead to the inference that the *Maṇimēkhalai* was probably written in the same atmosphere of Buddhism as perhaps that of the writer of the *Vijñānamātra Śāstra*.

The mention of the three Vaidika schools of *Pramāṇa*, and their teachers Vēdavyāsa, Kṛtakoṭi and Jaimini brings to our notice a point of great importance. That Jaimini is the teacher of *Pūrvamīmāmsā* and Vyāsa is the teacher and expounder of *Uttaramīmāmsā* are well-known. Kṛtakoṭi is hardly known. Kṛtakoṭi, however, seems to be the name of a work rather than that of the author,* and is said to be a commentary on the whole of

*It was pointed out at the Conference by Mr. T. R. Chintamani, B.A., Research Student from Madras, that on a consultation of four manuscripts in comparison with the published texts, the name Kṛtakoṭi appears as that of an individual and not of a work. The

the *Mīmāmsā* including the two divisions, *Pūrva* and *Uttara*. These two together are said to have consisted of twenty books, of which the first sixteen deal with *Pūrva*, and the remaining four with *Uttara Mīmāmsā*. The *Pūrvamīmāmsā* of twelve chapters is ascribed to Jaimini and is an investigation into '*dharma*' for its subject. Of the remaining chapters, the four last are entitled *Uttara* and ascribed to Vyāsa and their subject-matter is an enquiry into '*Brahma*.' The remaining four chapters called *Saṅkarsha Kāṇḍa* deal with the Dēvatās and are usually included in the *Pūrva*. The whole of the *Mīmāmsā Śāstra* composed of twenty chapters had a *bhāshya* or commentary written by Bōdhāyana, and known by the name Kṛtakoṭi. Owing to the vast extent of this, an abridgment of this commentary was made by Upavarsha who had another name Kṛtakoṭikavi according to the work *Samyamīnāmamālā*.* Even that was found too big for the ordinary understanding, and the part of sixteen books of it constituting the *Pūrvamīmāmsā* was further abridged by Dēvasvāmin. Thereafter the subject divides itself into two distinct works, *Pūrva* and *Uttara*, and they get further abridged by various commentators by retaining certain chapters and omitting others up to the time of Bhaṭṭakumāriḷa and Prabhākara.

position here taken however is not affected by this correction if this correction should turn out to be the true reading. If Kṛtakoṭi were the name of the work, the author could very well be referred to by the name of the work if it is of sufficient importance to be well-known. The point of importance here is that Bōdhāyana and Upavarsha were two different persons, and that Bōdhāyana wrote the commentary (*Vṛtti*) on the whole of the *Mīmāmsā* and perhaps came to be known as Kṛtakoṭi thereby.

* Manuscript in the Tanjore Palace Library.

This account of the *Mīmāmsā* is given in a work called *Prapañchahṛdaya* published in the Travancore Sanskrit Series by the late Mahāmahōpādhyāya Ganapati Sastri. Hence for our present purpose, Kṛtakoṭi is a commentary on the *Mīmāmsā Śāstra* including the two divisions, *Dharmakāṇḍa* and *Brahmakāṇḍa*. The author of this elaborate commentary was Bōdhāyana, otherwise known generally as Vṛittikāra. This author was earlier than Upavarsha, Dēvasvāmin, Bhavadāsa, Śabarasvāmi and onwards to Bhaṭṭakumāriḷa and Prabhākara. The commentators following Upavarsha seem to have been responsible for the division of the work into two distinct parts *Dharmakāṇḍa* and *Brahmakāṇḍa*, and since then the two parts seem to have been maintained so distinctly as ultimately to give the character of distinct *Śāstras* to the two divisions. *Maṇimēkhalai* it must be remembered, refers to Kṛtakoṭi as a teacher along with Jaimini and Vēdavyāsa. According to the *Prapañchahṛdaya*, the *Dharmakāṇḍa* or *Pūrvamīmāmsā* is ascribed to Jaimini, *Brahmakāṇḍa* or *Uttaramīmāmsā* to Vēdavyāsa. Bōdhāyana, however, wrote a commentary on the whole of the *Mīmāmsā Śāśtra*, both *Pūrva* and *Uttara Kāṇdas*. The collocation of the three names therefore is not in reference to distinct works, but seems to have reference to the distinctly authoritative position of the teachers. It must, therefore, have reference to a time when the authority of the commentator was at its highest, and stood as high as that of the two respective authors. If we should now, therefore, determine the date of Bōdhāyana and Upavarsha, that might throw some light upon the age of the *Maṇimēkhalai*, Bōdhāyana was certainly anterior to

Upavarsha. Upavarsha preceded Dēvasvāmin ; Dēvasvāmin was followed by Bhavadāsa, Bhavadāsa was followed by Śabarasvāmi. Bōdhāyana's date may be somewhere about the commencement of the Christian era, and *Maṇimēkhalai* may have followed close upon that, in the first or second century A.D., on this basis. It is the general opinion that the *Vṛttikāra*, Bōdhāyana as he now turns out to be, was responsible for the introduction into the *Mīmamsā*, discussions on the validity of knowledge, and that is what exactly is the position in which he is represented in the *Maṇimēkhalai*, although the Tamil classic associates Jaimini and Vēdavyāsa with him in the exposition of the *pramāṇas* applicable to the Vaidika path.*

9. This book again refers to the teaching of the Ājīvakas and Nirgranthas. The point worth remarking in the reference to these two systems is that they are, in this work, regarded as distinct systems not connected with each other. The Ājīvaka teacher is made to say that Markali was the worshipful one and that their holy book was a work known as *Navakadir*. Later Tamil writers on religious topics take it generally that the teaching of the two were divisions of Jainism.† The confusion between an Ājīvaka and a Jaina is as old as the Divyāvadāna itself.‡ *Maṇimēkhalai* maintains their distinct character. Even

* For the whole of this discussion see a note by Mr. A. Rangaswami Sarasvati in the *Journal of Indian History*, Vol. V, Pt. I, p. 107 ff. On p. 114 of this article he notes evidence for regarding Upavarsha as distinct from Āchārya Bōdhāyana.

† Sivajñāna Siddhiyār, the first verse in the *Ājivaka* Section (X).

‡ B M. Barua—*Ājīvakas*, Part I, p. 75.

before the date of Sivajñāna Siddhi, inscriptions refer to a tax in the Tamil country called *Ājīvaka Kāśu*, and that is supposed to have been levied for the benefit of Jaina settlements. The reference, therefore, to Ājīvaka as a separate sect, distinct from and independent of the Jainas is evidence of a time for *Maṇimēkhalai* when their distinct character was fully recognised.

10. The story of the poem is laid at Puhār or Kāvērippaṭṭinam at the mouth of the Kāvēri. In the course of the story the city is said to have been overwhelmed by the sea, and some of the more important citizens removed themselves from the place for safety to other places such as Vanji on the west coast and Kānchi in the north. Thereafter Uṟaiyūr continued to be the capital, and references to the Chōḻa capital are invariably to this latter city. This transformation is traceable even in the Śangam literature itself. The *Śirupāṇāṟṟuppaḍai*, a poem included in the Śangam collection and having reference to a chief in the region not far from Kānchi, speaking of the respective capitals of 'the three crowned kings' of the south mentions only Uṟaiyūr as the Chōḻa capital and has no reference whatsoever to Puhār. The occasion for reference, it must be remembered is merely to indicate that in comparison with the capital of the patron of that particular poem, these far-famed royal capitals themselves were poor. If Puhār had not suffered badly, this omission in that particular context would be altogether inexplicable. The book therefore has reference to a period of time somewhat earlier in the epoch of the Śangam than the very last period to which this poem may be referred. The existence of that chieftain in the country

round Kānchi with his important cities scattered all over the region known in historical times as Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam and Perumbāṇappāḍi, and the reference to the royal capitals of 'the three crowned kings' in an unfavourable comparison is again indication of an age when the kingdoms had declined visibly and the chieftains were coming into prominence. This happens in a region where the Pallavas held supreme authority from somewhere about the middle of the third century onwards to almost the tenth century.

11. The ruler contemporary with *Maṇimēkhalai* in Kāvērippaṭṭinam is known by the title Neḍumuḍikkiḷḷi, 'Kiḷḷi of the high crown,' and was the successor apparently of the great Chōḷa Karikāla. His son by a Nāga princess was the Toṇḍaimān ruler, Iḷam Tiraiyan, associated with Kānchi. Iḷam Tiraiyan seems to be a Śaṅgam celebrity. He is praised as a patron in one of the Śaṅgam poems, *Perumbāṇāṟṟuppaḍai*, the author of which composed another poem in celebration of the great Chōḷa ruler Karikāla, so that it is clear that he and Karikāla must have been famous in the life-time of one poet, although it is possible that the poet lived on to a ripe old age. Kānchi was at the time of the *Maṇimēkhalai* under the viceroyalty of the Chōḷa prince Iḷam Kiḷḷi, the younger brother of the ruler at Puhār. This younger brother won for the Chōḷa king, his elder brother, a victory at a place called Kāriyāṟu, against the combined armies of the Cēra and the Pāṇḍya. The identification of this river Kāri has so far not been satisfactorily made. It is now possible to identify it rather closely. The learned Editor of the work, Pandit MM. Swaminatha Aiyar, has drawn attention to the

occurrence of the name in a slightly different form in the *Periya Purāṇam.** He also draws attention to the reference that a Chōḻa king is said to have died at Kāriyāṟu. † Later references make it clear that the Kāri referred to is a river, and if a Chōḻa king probably died there, the reference is to his falling in battle on the banks of the river. The text states that the prince after the battle carried off a white umbrella, the symbol of protection that the king gave to his subjects. The victory is said to have been won against those with the emblem of the bow and the fish, meaning thereby the Cēra and the Pāṇḍya.

12. The Pāṇḍya seems to have been only an accessory; the Cēra must have been the principal enemy. During the period of the works under reference the ruling Cēra was Śeṅguṭṭuvan by name. His predecessor had extended his authority across the middle of the Peninsula comprising the Coimbatore and Salem districts, and had through the assistance of the Malayamān chieftain defeated the chief Ōri in the region of the Kollimalais ‡ in the Salem district, and is said to have consummated this victorious expansion of his territory and authority by celebrating an *abhishēka* of his in which he was able to bathe simultaneously in the waters of the two seas, the eastern and the western. This statement is explained by the fact that he celebrated a great *abhishēka* or royal ablution by bringing the water of the two seas by means of relays of elephants.§ Under

* *Periya Purāṇam*—Tirunāvukkaraśu-Nāyanār *Purāṇam*, Stanza 343.

† *Puranāṉūṟu*, 47 ; *Maṇimēkhalai*, Canto 19, ll. 126–27.

‡ *Aham*, 209 and Poems referring to Kāri and Ōri.

§ *Padiṟṟuppattu*, iii ; *Padigam*, 2.

his successor, Śeṅguṭṭuvan, the effort at expansion continued, and the opportunity was given by a great civil war that took place in the Chōḻa territory between the ruling Chōḻa and nine of his cousins, who simultaneously revolted against the succession of, it may be, Neḍumuḍikkiḷḷi. Śeṅguṭṭuvan reduced the rebels to subjection and restored his cousin the Chōḻa to a position of authority as a result of this victory. The victory was achieved at a place called Nerivāyil not far from Uṟaiyūr the capital.* Śeṅguṭṭuvan therefore had advanced so far as that. It was probably on a subsequent occasion that the Chōḻa ruler's brother Iḷam Kiḷḷi of Kānchi gained a victory over the combined armies of the Cēra and the Pāṇḍya at Kāriyāṟu. The territory between the two Pennars almost was included in the region generally known as Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam, which at one time was also called Perumbāṇappāḍi, the region of the Bṛhad Bāṇa. Over a considerable part of this region ruled the Malayaman chieftain Kāri with his capital at Tirukkōvilūr at this period. North of this territory was Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam proper with its headquarters at Kānchi. The territory of the Tiraiyan chief extended northwards to include the Pulicat Lake within it and possibly the northern boundary was marked by the Svarṇamukhi river which empties itself into the Bay of Bengal a little to the north of the Pulicat Lake. Pavattiri was the capital of an elder Tiraiyan, and Vēngaḍam is generally spoken of as the hill of the Toṇḍaiyar.† So the region properly belonging to the Toṇḍaiyar must have been actually to the northward of Kānchi,

---

* *Śilappadhikāram*, Book 28, ll. 117-27. *Padiṟṟuppattu* V.

† *Aham*, 85, 213, 340.

Kānchi being included within it. The viceroyalty of Kānchi therefore extended as far north as Tirupati and Kāḷahasti. That is the course of the Svarṇamukhi river if it did not go farther north to include the Gūḍūr Taluq within it. The war, therefore, must have taken place, it may be, by the activity of the people of Toṇḍaiyar supported by the Cēra and the Pāṇḍya, the natural enemies of the Chōḻas, as it were, or it may be to settle the point of rivalry between the Malayaman chief and the Chōḻa viceroy. This Kāriyāṟu, where the battle was fought, is now identifiable with some degree of certainty with a stream which passes through the railway station of Sūḷūrpet, and empties itself into the Pulicat Lake. Through most of its course, this river constitutes a twin stream, both of them taking their rise in the Nagari hills, one in the western group called Kāḷingi on the survey map, and the other taking its rise in the eastern group which is named on the larger maps as Kāleru. The two unite a little way down Sūḷūrpet, and the united stream empties itself into the Pulicat Lake. The name Kāleru now seems to be the name Kāri of old.* There is a place called Rāmagiri some distance from the source of the Kāleru stream in the eastern spurs of the Nagari hills, somewhere to the north of Satyavēḍu. The Śiva temple in the village goes by the name Vālīśvaram described in the records of the Chōḻa and early Vijayanagar periods as the temple of *Kārikkarai Uḍaiya Nāyanār*, that is, the Lord of the place Kārikkarai. Kārikkarai by itself would mean the bank of the Kāri. The

* Kāleru=Kāla+eru; the second word is river in Telugu. The first word would mean black which is the meaning of the Tamil word Kāri=Krishṇa in Sanskrit.

Periya Purāṇam in the context already noted above, refers to this temple where Appar or Tirunāvukkaraśu (Vāgīśvara in Sanskrit) is said to have worshipped. In describing the life of this devotee of Śiva, he is said to have gone to the great temple at Tiruvālangāḍu near Arkonam, then to Trippāśur near Tiruvallūr, and then travelled a great distance crossing hills and streams till at last he came to Tirukkārikkarai. After worshipping Śiva there, he reached in the next stage of his pilgrimage Kāḷahasti. Vālīśvaram at Rāmagiri answers to the Kārikkarai of this itinerary very closely, and as the writer of the *Periya Purāṇam*, the Life of the Śaiva Saints, lived in the period of the Chōḻas, the reference in the work may be regarded as relating to the period of the inscriptions. The tradition that Appar travelled in the seventh century along this line to various temples referred to above is an indication that the seventh century tradition knew of this Kārikkarai. The name could not have come into use all of a sudden in the seventh century seeing that it is the name of a minor natural feature, that of a river. The temple on its bank may have come into existence at any time, but the river must have been there. Therefore we may take it that this is the stream referred to as the battle-field where the Chōḻa fought against the Cēra and the Pāṇḍya combined. This finds support in the fact that the territory and towns much farther north were included in the Tamil land of the Toṇḍamān or Tiraiyan chieftains, and in the inscriptions of the Chōḻa period there is mention of a place called Kākaṇḍi described as having been situated in the district of Pavattiri, which became submerged in the sea. Kākaṇḍi is another name for Kāvērippaṭṭinam,

derived from a ruler Kākaṇḍa,* and if this northern city took its name from that, the capital city of the Chōḻas, that region must have been under the authority of the Chōḻas. Kāriyāṟu may, therefore, be now definitely taken to be the eastern of the twin streams forming the river Kāḷingi which flows into the Pulicat Lake as one stream.

13. From what has been said in the section above of the battle fought on the banks of the river Kāri, it is likely that the period referred to was the period of the ascendency of Śeṅguṭṭuvan Cēra in the south, and that is the later period of the greatest activity of the Third Tamil Śaṅgam. The advance of the Cēra and the Pāṇḍya so far north, it would be difficult to postulate at any other period subsequent to A.D. 300, as afterwards the region was dominated by the Pallavas who were a comparatively minor, though considerable, power up to the middle of the sixth century. From the beginning of that century, they were rapidly coming into great importance, so much so that at the end of it they stood out the dominant power in South India. The Chōḻa country had been reduced more or less to comparative insignificance, Pallava authority being recognised as far south as the Kāvēri early in the following century. The Pallavas maintained their dominance till about the tenth century, and the powers with whom these had to contend in the particular region indicated were the Chāḷukyas, Western and Eastern, and when the Western Chāḷukyas were overthrown, the Rāshṭrakūṭas. The likely period of battle between the actual contending parties in

---

* *Maṇimēkhalai*, XXII, ll. 25–38.

this battle seems almost impossible after A.D. 300 in our present state of knowledge of South Indian History.

14. Before concluding, however, it may be as well to invite attention to one or two other points which have been made use of as decisive factors in settling the chronology of the work. One of these is the astronomical detail in the work which refers to the *Nakshatra Viśākha* as the fourteenth. This implies the counting of the *Nakshatra* from the *Kṛttikā* as the starting point. If this detail were taken bodily from the old Buddhist tradition as the reference is merely to the date of the birth of the Buddha, at which there was to be the miraculous appearance of his begging bowl also, nothing could be argued from this. But in regard to the chronology of the work, such tradition may have been centuries older. There is nothing, however, to show that it was so copied from an older tradition. There is a reference to *Kuchchara-Kuḍikai.** This is an exact equivalent of the Sanskrit Gurjara Guṭikā. The philological equivalence is absolutely sound; but the argument built upon it involves other assumptions which cannot yet be taken to be established beyond doubt. The mention of the term Gurjara there is taken to involve the assumption that the Gurjaras must have constructed a structure. I am aware of the tradition among the Gurjaras themselves that they were expert builders as noted by the late Mr. Jackson.† Among the skilled artisans who are referred to in the same work as having been employed in the building of the royal hall of Kāvērippaṭṭinam, the Gurjaras do not find mention.

* *Maṇimēkhalai*, Canto 18, l. 152.

† See Appendix A, *Bom. Gaz.*, I, Pt. i, note.

The Magadhas, the Mahrattas, the Avantis* and the Yavanas are said to have co-operated with the artisans of the Tamil land in the construction of this great audience hall. While therefore the philological equivalence may be admitted as quite correct, that is not the only possible equivalent for the term. The term is used there to indicate a small shrine of the guardian-deity of Kāvērippaṭṭinam, called Champāpati. The term *Guṭikā* does not necessarily imply that it was anything like a big structure or temple. The fact seems to be that it was a cave with a small awning in front in lieu of a verandah (this is the kind of structure that was among the earliest known in South India) which could in Tamil be described as a *Kuchchara-Kuḍikai*, which would mean nothing more than a small shrine with short rafters and roofed with thatch of some kind. Further, the thesis that the Gurjaras were foreigners and were unknown in India before the Hun invasions is a thesis which has yet to be proved. The connection between the Huns and the Gurjaras has no legs to stand upon worth the name, and their ethnical connection seems altogether unprovable. The matter will have to be taken up for separate investigation, and stands uncertain at present, like so many other dynastic names. The term Gurjara is a native word which has been Sanskritised somewhat absurdly, and an origin is devised to explain the absurd Sanskritisation as in the case of the Pallava,

* In a more elaborate recital, we have the Magadhas as jewel-workers; Yavanas as carpenters; Avantis as blacksmiths; Kośalas as painters; and Vatsas as stucco-workers; and there is another people, the name of which is gone, described as goldsmiths. None of these come anywhere near the Gurjaras.

Chāḷukya, Hoyśāla and so on. It seems, therefore, clear, that it would be putting the cart before the horse to hold this detail as a decisive indication of the age, and of a weight sufficient to overthrow the whole volume of evidence set forth above. From the chronological point of view, therefore, *Maṇimēkhalai* must be regarded as a work of the first two centuries of the Christian era, and the School of Buddhism referred to therein, presided over by Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ, must have been a school of that age, or anterior to that. Hence the conclusion seems reasonable that the system of Buddhist logic taught by Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ was the system that found its shining exponent in the famous Buddhist logician, Diṅnāga, in his work *Paramāṇa Samuchchaya* and elaborated by his commentator Dharmakīrti, both of them having been born in Kānchi.

15. This conclusion is confirmed in a way much more definitely than by any other piece of evidence hitherto discussed in the work itself. In Chapter XXIX where Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ discusses the instruments of knowledge by which knowledge or truth has to be acquired he gives the five-limbed syllogism of *Akshapāda* and *Vātsyāyana* as the accepted method of approach. Though there is perhaps later on an indication that these five may be reducible to three, he teaches the five-limbed syllogism as the current method of approach. It is well-known that Diṅnāga it was that reduced the five-limbed syllogism of *Akshapāda* and *Vātsyāyana* to the three-limbed syllogism of Aristotle. The other distinctive features of Diṅnāga's logic seem also to find their root here, but will receive fuller treatment elsewhere. What has been said above gives a clear

enough indication that the school of Buddhism, at the head of which stood Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ, was anterior to that of Diṅnāga whose date is now generally accepted as in the fourth century A.D., say, roughly about A.D. 400.

[*Paper read at the Fourth Session of the Oriental Conference at Allahabad—Reprinted from the Volume of Proceedings of the Conference.*]

Maiyilarpu.

Professor Franklin Edgerton of Yale, the learned editor of the *Pañchatantra*, wished to know, during his stay in Madras, whether I knew of any place which would correspond to the Mahiḷārōpya of the *Pañchatantra*, as he suspected that it might be a place in South India. Having regard to the difficulty that he himself suggested, that the word did look quite as a Sanskrit expression, I suggested to him that, as Sanskrit authors were sometimes in the habit of Sanskritising words of other Indian languages, Mahiḷārōpya may possibly be a Sanskritising from the word 'Maiyiḷāṛpu', which was the old name of Mylapore, and I put together the following note for his information. As the remarks may be of some use to others as well as to the learned professor, I am publishing it as a note in the *Indian Antiquary*. Should the possibility of a closer connection between Mahiḷārōpya and Maiyilāṛpu seem to me worth putting forward, I shall take occasion to send another similar note then.

The town or the ward which goes by the name of Mylapore in modern times, is hardly referred to in that form in Tamil literature. The form usually found there is *Mayilai* with various additions in the shape of affixes and prefixes of a more or less complimentary character according to occasion. The combination in which it usually occurs is

Mallai and *Mayilai** in the period of Pallava ascendency, *Mallai* standing for what we now know as Mahābalipuram and *Mayilai* similarly standing for Mylapore as we call it at present in the Anglo-Indian form of the name. But this *Mayilai* seems at one period of history, a pretty long period, to have taken the form of *Mayilāṛpu* in inscriptions, and even in literature, notwithstanding the fact that the ordinary form is *Mayilai*, as I stated already, is found in inscriptions ranging from the seventh year of Kampavarman, one of the last Pallavas in the ninth century, down to almost the end of the eleventh century. This occurs in inscriptions in various localities where flourished mercantile guilds or communities called *Vaḷanjiyar* in Tamil, *Baṇajigas* in Kanarese, *Baḷija* in Telugu. corresponding exactly to the North Indian term *Baniya*. A community of 500, referred to as connected with Mylapore, entered into an agreement of a mercantile and fiscal character, along with matters of local government, in respect of the town.† Some of these inscriptions belong to Tiruvottiyūr, a northern suburb of Madras where the donor is described as coming from Mayilāṛpu, defined as belonging to the particularly smaller unit of its own name, and the larger division of the country, giving us to understand unmistakably that what is referred to is the then little town of

* Tirumangai Alvār's *Periya-Tirumoḻi*, II, iii, 2, 9, 10 *Nandikkalambakam*, versees 1, 3, 24, 44, 51, 55 for *Mayilai*. Verse 69, however, shows the form Mayilāpuri in some MSS. and this is only a variant of Mayilai. Verses 1, 9, 25, 34, 40, 46, 54, 72, 73, 75, 83, 88 for *Mallai*.

† No. 256 of 1912 and section 25 of the *Epigraphical Report* for 1913.

Mylapore.* Thus we have inscriptional authority for the name Mayilāṛpu in inscriptions of Kampavarman datable to the ninth century, of Rājarāja datable in the early years of the eleventh century, and one or two others in charters generally referred to the eleventh century.

Mayilāṛpu in Tamil falls into two parts, '*Mayil*' peacock, and '*āṛpu*,' an abstract noun or noun of action, from '*āl*' to move, a movement indicating the peculiarly majestic strut of the peacock. In literature it is ordinarily described as a feature peculiar to the peacock dancing in this fashion, as it is a peculiar feature of the cuckoo to sing, as in *mayil āla* and *kuyil ahava*, the two verbs, *āla* meaning to move, and *ahava* meaning to speak or produce sound. In the *Prabandham* of the Vaishṇavas, in the section relating to Triplicane in the work of Tirumangai Ālvār,† the dancing of the peacock is described in general terms as a feature of Mylapore in describing the shrine of Triplicane. That is so far indirect. But in the *Tēvāram* of Appar referable to the previous century, in the middle of the seventh century at the latest, there are two clear references‡ where the place is referred to as *Mayilāppil*. The

* No. 261 of 1910, 18th year of Rājarāja I: No. 189 of 1912, 7th year of Kampavarman.

† *Periya-Tirumoḻi*, II, 3, 7.

குரவமேகமழுங் குளிர்பொழிலூடு
குயிலொடு மயில்கள் நின்றால.

‡ Appar, *Kōilpakka-tiruttāṇḍakam*, I, 1.

மங்குல் மதிதவழு மாடவீதி
மயிலாப்பி லுள்ளார் மருக லுள்ளார்.

Tiru-Vīraṭṭānam, *Kāpputtiruttāṇḍakam*, 12 :

வளநீர் வளம்பெருகு மாணிருபமும்
மயிலாப்பில் மன்னினார் மன்னியேத்தும்.

last particle in the compound *il* is a case affix of the locative in Tamil. Therefore in the nominative it would stand *Mayilāppu*. The second part of the word *āppu* is a permissable variant of the Tamil *aṛpu*, so that *Mayilāppu* in the *Tēvāram* is the exact equivalent of the classical Tamil form *Mayilāṛpu*. So from the seventh century to the eleventh or the twelfth, we have references in one way or another to the form of the name *Mayilāṛpu*.

We may find justification for this interpretation of the name in the fact that these names are found associated with the names of the local deities usually. In the case of Mylapore there is a Vishṇu shrine and there is a Śiva shrine, both of them native to the town, and taken to have come into existence along with the town itself. While the goddess of the Śiva shrine is Karpakāmbāḷ, the goddess of the Vishṇu shrine is Mayūravalli. The latter particle in the two words being merely honorific, we see that it is the Vishṇu goddess that has the name *Mayūra*, the Sanskrit equivalent to the Tamil *mayil*. Probably she was regarded as the guardian deity of the town, and thus partook of the name of the locality. There is justification for this that in the decad* devoted to the Śiva shrine in Mylapore in the Śaiva collection, the *Tēvāram*, the temple of Śiva, Kapālīchcharam (Kapālīśvaram) is described as being in a part of *Mayilai*, meaning thereby that while remaining in Mylapore, still it did not constitute the whole of *Mayilāṛpu*

---

* See stanza 4 in Śambandar's *Pūmbāvaittiruppadikam*, where Kapālīchcharam (Kapālīśvaram) formed a ward of *Maiyilai* :—

கூர்தருவேல் வல்லார்க்கு
கொற்றங்கொள் சேரிதனில்
கார்தருசோலைக் கபாலீச்சரம்.

proper, which would go to show that the guardian deity of the townlet proper must have been the Vishṇu goddess, and thus the Vishṇu shrine marks the core of the town known as *Mayilāṛpu*.

The occurrence of the peacock feature in the St. Thomas' legends associated with Mylapore only confirms, or is entirely in keeping with, the origin of the name as explained above. It looks likely that the name had been given to the place because of the large number of peacocks found in the place and the noise they were accustomed to make. In fact, very many of the names of localities in Madras, the names of the various wards of the town, take their origin from features of a physical character like this. To give but one instance, Chepauk is from Tamil *Śēlpākkam*, meaning the shore-hamlet where fish of the *śēl* variety abounded. Vēpēry,* Puraśavākkam,† etc., would be other instances.

I shall not make any attempt to establish any connection between Mayilāṛpu as such and Mahiḷārōpya of the *Pañchatantra* as such. I am concerned only to show that *Mayilāṛpu* was the recognised old name of what now goes by the name Mylapore, which after all is different from it only to the extent of a comparatively slight metathesis, a change commonly found in many other well-known names, from which, by Sanskritization, Mahiḷārōpya is possible of derivation.

[*Reprinted from the Indian Antiquary, Vol. LVI,* 1927].

---

* *Vēppu+ēri*=margosa tank.

† *Puraśa+pākkam=Pūvaraśu* or *Puraśu+pākkam*: Sea-shore hamlet of the Indian 'fig with flowers', or even Puraśu (*Butea frondosa*). The former tree is a feature of the locality, the latter is not.

Pancaratra in Classical Tamil Literature.

The *Pāñcarātra* (=P.) system of worship is widely prevalent in South India, and may be said to be the general religious practice of the Vaishṇavas of the South. It is intertwined in the system of *Bhakti* or worship, the essential feature of which is devotion to a personal God intervening in the affairs of the earth for the benefit and ultimate good of mankind. As such, it is a common feature among the worshippers of Śiva and Vishṇu. In the Vaishṇava form it is called P. and in the Śaiva form it is known as Trika in Kashmir, and goes by the name Śaiva Āgama, Āgama being the common designation for the whole. In certain classes of writings, particularly of the strict Śaivas*, P. is regarded as a form of religion outside the fold of what is orthodox following the Veda teachings, and is relegated to a position of what the orthodox describe as the *Pāshaṇḍi* form of Śaiva worship. Seeing the wide prevalence of the cult among by far the largest number of the worshippers of Vishṇu in the South, and the great influence it has exercised in smoothing the acerbity between the orthodox Brahmanism and the more modern Vaishṇavism, one is surprised that it should be regarded (*avaidika*) un-Vedic.

There are two distinct schools of opinion represented by great names in regard to the matter. Śaṅkara† at the

* Śivajñāna-Siddhiyār.

† *Brahma-Sūtra Bhāṣya* II, 2, 40 ff. See also *JRAS.* 1911, p. 95 and note 1.

top of all seems to be inclined to the view that P. rests on no Vedic authority acceptable to the orthodox view. That it is Vedic out and out has been argued elaborately by Yāmunāchārya, his great grandson and successor Rāmānuja himself, and later Vedānta Dēśika. For a number of centuries therefore, the discussion seems to have gone on, and it may be hazardous to venture even now that it is recognised as an orthodox system though it is so among the Vaishṇavas generally. Our concern is not primarily whether it is orthodox or heterodox. It is much more as to where or how it took its origin, and how it came to exercise the great influence that it did, and how far we can really trace its active influence in recognised authorities.

We can trace references to the P. in some of the works of the earlier of the Āḻvārs, and could carry it back perhaps through Sanskrit literature to times much anterior, as well-known to readers of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar's Vaishṇavism, Śaivism, etc. We may refer to an excellent article by the late Mr. A. Govindacharya on the same subject*.

For our present purpose, it is hardly necessary to go into the details of the question. It is traceable at least back to the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa†, where there is a reference to the Pāñcarātra-sattra. At the next stage, we seem to come upon a reference to a developed study of the subject in the reference to *Ēkāyana* in the *Chāndōgya-Upaniṣad*‡), where among what Nārada had learnt occurs Ēkāyana along with the other twelve well-known divisions

* *JRAS.* 1911, pp. 935–61.
† XII, 3, 4 and XIII, 6. 1.
‡ VII, 1. 2.

of learning, Although Ekāyana has been interpreted otherwise by early translators, we have good authority in the literature of the P. itself* that the term Ēkāyana stands for the P. We need hardly refer to the evidence in Pāṇini and Patāñjali. It would be enough to state that there is a full discussion of the subject in the Nārāyaṇīya section of the Śāntiparvan of the *Mahābhārata*†. The P. itself claims authority in nothing less than the Veda itself.

Leaving aside literature, we have the evidence of inscriptions for the prevalence of Vishṇu worship in the form recognised by the Āgamas, worship of idols representing Vishṇu in temples etc., in the Besnagar Pillar Inscription‡ of the 2nd century B.C., and the occurrence of the term Saṅkarshaṇa in a prominent position in the Nānāghat Inscription§ of queen Nāganikā, giving indication of the prevalence of this form of worship at that time.

References to Krishṇa and Baladēva as popular gods of worship, we come across with in the Śaṅgam literature of the Tamils. Krishṇa and Baladēva, or as it sometimes occurs Vishṇu and the White One are referred to on a footing with Śiva and Subrahmaṇya¶. Among therefore beings worshipped by the Tamils, those hold a place as popular as the others. Among this class of literature, there is one collection—in fact all of them are

* *Īśvara Saṃhitā*, I. 18 and *JRAS*. 1911, p. 935.

† Ch. 336–58; also *Ind. Ant.* XXXVII (1908), pp. 251–262; 373-386.

‡ *JRAS*. 1910, p. 817.

§ *A. S. W. I. V.* p. 74.

¶ *Puṛam* 56, 58 and *Śilap*. V. ll. 170–71.

collections—known as *Paripāḍal*, because of a particular form of composition of the poems in Tamil. This collection is described to have been one of seventy poems, of which only 22 have so far been recovered, and a few of them happen to be in a very imperfect condition. Among these, there are five devoted to Vishṇu, and these five contain matter which seem more or less to be the P. in a more primitive form than the *Samhitās* of the P. which are 108 in number of various dates and of varying grades of authority. Three of this large number are supposed to be the most ancient and of the highest authority, namely, the *Sātvata*, the *Pauṣkara* and the *Jaya**. As a rule subjects requiring serious thought remained long matter for discussion and got organised into regular systems only after a considerable period of general development. It is in some such intermediate stage that we seem to get at P. in these poems, namely, poems 1, 2, 3, 4, 13 and 15. Of these the full text of the first two are not available, although we have a considerable part of the second by an old poet known by the name Kīrandaiyār. The first is neither full, nor even in satisfactory condition of arrangement of the words of the text, and that is by the poet Peruṅdēvanār who made the *Bhārata* in Tamil, as he is said to have composed the introductory poems to all the eight collections of the Śaṅgam poems. The second is by the poet Kīrandaiyār, an old poet of whom not much more is known. It is possible he is the famous poet referred to in the *Śilappadhikāram*†. Three and four are by a poet named Kaḍuvan Iḷa-Eyinan. Thirteen is by a poet Nal Eḻini and fifteen by Iḷam Peruvaḻudi.

* Recently published in the *GOS.* LIV.

† Book XXIII, 1. 12.

Of these four poets, the two latter seem to be other than Brahmans judging by their names. The former two were probably Brahmans. The purpose of each one of the poems is an invocation to Vishṇu, something like a prayer offered to him. Naturally therefore the prayer would take the from of describing God in his true form, and praising his deeds of benefit to humanity. In doing so, these poems seem to indicate unmistakably a certain well-understood division of the subject. The first section seems devoted to a philosophical description of the Godhead. Then follow a few prominent instances of the exhibition of His grace in his intervention for the benefit of humanity at large. Then come the forms in which his activity showed itself in creation, etc., and the forms that He assumes for doing this. Then follows a division where His omnipresence and immanence in all beings find description, and lastly the forms that he assumes for the uninitiated, at least the forms in which he ought to be worshipped by those devoted to him in the shape of idols. These five seem to be, in a somewhat inchoate form, the five divisions that we know of from the P. texts, namely, the *Parā* (the transcendent supreme form, called in this condition Para-Vāsudēva). Next come his *Vyūhas* (the forms in which he goes to action in the process of creation, etc.). Thirdly comes the projection of his power in various forms as an exhibition of grace for saving humanity from perils. These are the *Vibhava* forms, popularly known as the *Avatāras* of Vishṇu. Then comes a description of his position as *Antar-Yāmin* ("He who moves within every created being"), and finally the various forms in which he may be worshipped, called *Archa* forms. These five topics are dealt with in four divisions in

the P. In the first division, it is *jñāna*, where God's nature is the object of search. Then comes the *yōga*, the act of devotion or *bhakti*. Then comes the *cāryā*, discipline or conduct in a worshipper, and then *kriyā*, the mode of worship*.

Each one of these five poems can be legitimately described as a prayer addressed to Vishṇu. All of them alike seem to combine in various ways all the five features of Vishṇu's divine activity in different degrees of elaboration according to the special inclination of the author. It may be that the variations in the degree of elaboration are not exactly a question of the whim of the author, but may be guided by the occasion that called for it, which is quite a reasonable postulate. Either way, what is material to us for the present discussion, is that we do not find these five divisions in any set form. None the less, all the five features seem to find mention.

---

* The *Paripāḍal* has recently been brought out in an excellent edition by the veteran scholar Pandit Dr. MM. Swaminatha Aiyar, who deserves honour — almost as much as those who have been responsible for the production in the first instance — for the study of the Śaṅgam works, which were fast being forgotten even by the Tamil public, by excellent editions of most of these classics. We do not exclude those others that had the enterprise to publish two or three of these, but even they recognised their obligations to him as the pioneer leader in this particular field. It is his edition of the *Paripāḍal* that has enabled me to study this question, and the credit of having made this source available to me is due to his exertions in the field. I acknowledge with pleasure therefore my obligation to his work, and all references to the *Paripāḍal* in the course of the paper are to his edition published in 1918.

To illustrate how these poets conceived of Vishṇu in the highest form, the following translation of the first 25 lines of the poem 2 by Kīrandaiyār is a good specimen :—

"When both this earth and the golden heaven had become empty, when the sun and moon had ceased to be, without going their accustomed course in alternation, the very sky itself had lost its beauty at the end of each æon of time. Many such æons have in series come and ceased to be ; the æons in which the ether alone existed containing in it the sound in potential form, from which atoms invisible come into existence unseen and grow still invisible ; the æons in which the air which puts everything in motion had its appearance ; the æons in which fire took its origin form air, and glowed ; the æons in which mist and cloud emerge therefrom ; the æons coming after in which the earth, submerged in the waters, emerges again to be the home of the four elements above described. When such æons in number innumerable, but named *Neydal*, *Kuvaḷai*, *Āmbal*, *Śankham*, *Kamalam*, and *Veḷḷam**, had come and gone, the present Śvētavarāha Kalpa, which gets its name from the boar, which brought the earth above the waters, stands but as evidence of one of your deeds. But these give not your age, inconceivable in all its divisions. Such a primal one You are ; we shall cherish you in worshipful reverence."

"You are, they say, the younger born to the one white as conch ; you are indeed the younger brother of *Vāḷiyōn* (the white one, Baladēva) ; to him that wears dark garments, and has the palmirah for his flag, some say you are older ; to them indeed, you are the older of the two. In accordance with the investigations of those of faultless convictions into the eternal Veda (*Kēḷvi*)†, you are immanent in all created beings. This condition of Your being, understood properly, is the peculiar condition of Your eternal existence."

In this passage both the sections refer to the character of the eternally existing supreme being. The first section

---

* These represent an ascending series of numbers beyond the Indian crore.

† Literal translation of the Sansk. *Śruti*.

includes in it a reference—a mere reference—to the boar incarnation of Vishṇu to bring the submerged earth above the primal waters. To this extent it covers section 3 referring to Vishṇu's beneficent activity of coming down to the earth to do good to humanity. The second section dealing with another feature of Vishṇu's eternal existence brings under reference the changing relationship between Krishṇa and Baladēva, and to that extext again there is a reference to the *Vibhava* in the Krishṇa-*Avatāra* of Vishṇu. In a subsequent passage the same author describes Vishṇu in various other forms, as the forms in which he made his presence understood of the learned. He refers to this latter in the term *andaṇar*, which is synonymous with Brahmans. The passage in lines 63 to 67 may be translated as follows :— "The words of the chief priest, the actual celebrant of a sacrifice*, the sacrificial post to which is held fast the animal to be sacrificed ; the kindling of the fire (by churning the wood) to the chanting of the well-famed *Mantras* in prescribed form and making it glow, these constitute respectively Your form, Your food, and the way that learned Brahmans see You in order to carry conviction to those that will not see You."

Pœms 3 and 4 are by one author, and between them cover all the five of the features above described more or less completely. The only part that is not dealt with in sufficient fulness is the very last the *Archa* form, the form of idols in which people unlearned in the Veda, could conceive of him and worship him. They are by the pœt Kaḍuvan Iḷa-Eyinan, a non-Brahman pœt judging by the

* This refers to the terms of address in which God is invoked.

name. This is the general drift of the whole pœm; the exposition of the actual truth in regard to the nature of the supreme (*Param*). The boar incarnation is under reference in lines 16–17 and 21–24. Krishṇa and Baladēva are referred to in lines 20–25. The weapons of Vishṇu and his other features find description in lines 28–58. There is a reference to Vishṇu's intervention to give nectar to the gods in lines 65–73. The first sixty lines as a whole may be said to describe creation; lines 60–80 immanence. In lines 81–84 there is the clearest reference to the *Vyūhas*. Lines 85–90 is a description of the form or figure of Vishṇu, which does service for the *Archa* form. In lines 90–94 he reverts to the supreme, but in his form as sleeping in the couch of snake on the primal waters with the lotus from the naval, and Brahma in it. The form *Padmōdbhava* is under reference in two places, lines 12–13 and 90–94. There is a reference to Trivikrama in line 20, to Krishṇa killing Kēśi in line 32, and to Mōhini in lines 33–34. It must be noted here that in line 68, there is a reference to the large number of Āgamas for which the word used is *Kēḷvi*, a term which ordinarily means the Veda in the wider sense of the term, the Tamil word being actually a translation of the Sanskrit, *Śruti*. But here the term *Śruti* will not do. We have to take it as referring to the Āgamas, " large in number and comprehensive in treatment ", an indication that the author was aware of the works that go by the class name Āgama. The reference to the *Vyūhas* in lines 81–84 are the clearest possible. They are *Kāri* (Krishṇa) of the red-eye, *Veḷḷai* (White-one) with black eyes, *Pacchai* (Pradyumna, Pr. Pajjumma) of green colour, *Māl* (Aniruddha) of yellowish green body. There can be no mistaking that the reference here is to the

four *Vyūhas*. These four are as clearly described in stanza 44 of the poem *Tirucchandaviruttam*, by one of the earlier Āḻvārs, Āḻvār Tirumaḻiśai. Poem 4 as a whole describes the external form of the Supreme as well as the various qualities that the supreme form exhibits for the benefit of humanity. But the whole description can be translated into the form of images, and hence ought to be taken as being devoted to the *Archa* form, the material form in which devotees can worship him. Among the *Avatāras*, the *Vibhava* form, which are under reference in this poem, there is a reference to Nṛsimha with mention of Prahlāda in lines 10–21. There is a reference to Krishṇa and Baladēva in lines 36–40.

Poem 13 by another author gives a general description of the form of the Supreme in lines 1–13. Lines 14–26 are devoted to all the elements finding their being in him. Lines 26–37 refer to the *Śēṣaśāyin*, the sleeping Vishṇu on the serpent couch, Baladēva and Varāha, all three being as one in three forms. The rest of the poem is devoted to the description of his qualities for grace. Poem 15 seems entirely devoted to the last section, the *Archa* section. The poem lays itself out to praise Vishṇu in the form of the brothers, Krishṇa and Baladēva in residence on the hill at Tirumāl-Iruṁ Śōlai near Madura. It gives the indication that his grace is attainable by those who can go and worship on the hill. To those who find that too much, the worship of the hill from a distance itself would be equally efficacious.

In the course of the poem, however, there are references throughout which can refer to one or the other of the

other four features of this group of five. These five poems therefore in the old collection can be referred to as Pāñcarātrāik in their tendency as in explicit form.

But one feature has to be noted particularly having regard to the variety of views taken by even great authorities of a later time. The poems themselves mention that these are features of the Supreme, well-attested by the Veda and Vedic literature, and associated with Vedic studies. The statement is made sometimes more explicitly; but where they are only allusive and not obvious, the commentator who, an expert Āgamist as the hereditary priest of a temple at Kānchi, lived at a time much later, expounds as having reference to Veda and Vedic authorities, in one place actually referring to the *Mīmāmsā* where God is said to appear in different forms to different people. There is under reference in lines 61–68 of poem 2, where he figures as the person addressed by the celebrating priest of sacrifice, the sacrificial post itself, etc. The first point to note here is that the person addressed as the Surpreme is quoted as under the authority of the *Pūrva Mīmāmsā* of Jaimini. God is supposed to appear to ordinary men in the form of the idols made to represent him, to the orthodox Brahman learned in Veda in the form of sacrificial fire, to the Yōgis who devote themselves to the realisation of God, he appears in their hearts, and to those who are possessed of the actual true knowledge (*Jñānins*) everywhere. This the author describes as the way that Brahmans see Him, according to the commentator.

Dr. Schrader in his learned introduction to the *Ahirbudhnya Samhitā* has laid it down that the earlier P. works

mention the *Vyūhas*, and texts that do not contain mention of those ought to be regarded as later*. Another feature which exhibits an earlier stage of developmont in these poems is the more frequent mention of the two, Vāsudēva and Saṅkaraṣaṇa along with the four *Vyūhas*. The reference to these two alone is scattered freely over the whole of Tamil classical literature. The reference to Saṅkarṣaṇa in the inscription of queen Nāganikā would perhaps indicate this body of literature is fairly of the same age as the inscription. Dr. Schrader himself regarded this as a feature, which requires consideration†. If the upper limit of the P. texts is A. D. 300, as the same scholar has indicated, these poems would belong to a stage earlier by these indications alone. But the chronological consideration is governed primarily by the fact that this belongs to the eight collections called by the Tamils, Śaṅgam Collections; the invocatory poems to these eight were composed by Peruṅdēvanār, who did the *Bhārata* in Tamil. The doing of the *Bhārata* in Tamil, the establishment of the Śaṅgam and the battle of Talaiyālangānam are brought together soon after the prevalence of a famine and the successful efforts made by a Pāṇḍya monarch to ward off its evil effects in the large Śinnamanūr plates of the tenth centuey A. D. published in the South Indian Inscriptions‡. This has to be taken as long anterior to the earliest Pāṇḍyan referred to in another important grant of the Pāṇḍyas, the so-called Vēḷvikkuḍi grant§. The period of

* An Introduction to the P., p. 19 and n. 3.

† *Ibid.* p. 17, n. 1.

‡ *S. I. I.* Vol. III, Part 4.

§ *Ep. Ind.* XVII, No. 16.

Śaṅgam activity must be anterior to the time when the collections were made, and if the collections were made by the poet who made the *Bhārata* in Tamil, the position is clearly that the work *Paripāḍal* under reference ought to be an early work of the period of Śaṅgam activity and that the collection could not have taken place on this side of the early part of the third century A. D. An exhaustive examination of the internal evidence of this body of literature called Śaṅgam literature itself leads only to that conclusion. An effort is made in the latest issue of the *J.R.A.S.*, and the Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society Bangalore simultaneously, by Mr. K. G. Sankar confirming the date, one of two dates really considered as the possible dates by the late Mr. Swamikannu Pillai, namely, A. D. 634. The late lamented scholar found that the data contained in the *Paripāḍal* 11 would support a date A. D. 17 or a date A. D. 634, not perfectly but with certain modifications. The need for modifications makes it suspicious, and hence, on a consideration of the question, Professor Jacobi * came to the conclusion, after examining the poem carefully, that the poet was not exactly astronomical in his statement, and it may not be satisfactory to build an astronomical conclusion on his data, which to him appeared to be more or less an arrangement of the planets in places where their influence would be most favourable for the purpose that the poet had in mind, plentiful rain and the appearance of freshes in the river Vaigai which is the river actually celebrated in the poem. He felt that the crux of the whole question therefore becomes one of what the texts were intended to convey

* Introduction to the author's Calcutta University Readership lectures : *Contribution of South India to Indian Culture*, pp. xvii—xx.

rather than the astronomical data contained therein. As far as I am able to see without professing to be an expert in this line, there is nothing advanced in this more recent effort to confirm the late Mr. Swamikannu Pillai's position, or to carry it any further than where he left it. This is not the place where I should undertake a more elaborate discussion of the question. It is enough to state that the historical details that can be gathered form this body of literatures will not at all suit a date in the earlier half of the seventh century by any means. Whatever be the actual date of the Śaṅgam, it may be said with confidence it cannot be A. D. 634. On the chronological side therefore there is nothing to invalidate the position that the poems dedicated to Vishṇu in the *Paripāḍal* mark an earlier stage in the development of the P., than the fully developed *Samhitās* would indicate. That is one thing that comes out of this comparatively brief investigation.

The other really more important investigation is the light that the poems throw upon its Vedic character in regard to which we are left in no doubt whatsoever. The Brāhmaṇas, the Vedas, the Upaniṣads, and even the Sāmaveda are found stated as authorities in the texts themselves. The *Vyūhas* are specifically and umistakably mentioned. The *Vibhavas* are mentioned, among them some, that do not find mention in the orthodox *Purāṇic* lists of *Avātaras*. Dr. Schrader has collected a list of 39 such from the *Pāñcarātra-Samhitās* alone*, some of which (say the Padmōbbhava form) are of frequent occurrence. These early texts therefore seem to establish beyond a doubt the

* Introduction to the P., p. 42.

orthodox character of the P. The matter is worthy of further investigation. It is hoped this short enquiry will pave the way to a more elaborate and fuller investigation of the subject.

[*Contributed to the Professor Winternitz Festschrift, 1932.*]

Tantra.

Does the word mean a treatise in general, or an authoritative treatise in any subject, as perhaps in a somewhat specialised application of the term ?

The question arises with respect to the name *Pañcatantra* for the well-known work so-called. The suspicion perhaps, that the word Tantra in the compound word means a book or treatise, is heightened when we consider the alternative name Tantrākhyāyika, that which is named Tantra. The St. Petersburgh Dictionary, I understand, gives the word the meaning "treatise", and I find even ordinary dictionaries give a meaning somewhat similar, as for instance V. S. Apte gives it the meaning "a scientific treatise", with the alternative, a chapter of a treatise like that. This aspect of the meaning of the word seems borne in upon us when the *Mālavikāgnimitra* refers to the authority of the *Arthaśāstra*, Kauṭilya's according to the commentary, by the term Tantrakāra, thereby making it clear that Tantram there is an authoritative treatise—an authoritative treatise on the subject under discussion.

What we wish to point out here is principally that the great commentators of Tamil have a notion somewhat akin to it, and this prevalent notion of the commentators in Tamil may be a reflex merely of a corresponding usage in Sanskrit. A standard work in Tamil like the *Kuṟaḷ* applies the term *Nūl*, which is an exact equivalent of Tantra, admitting that it has the sense of an authoritative treatise

upon any particular subject. The author of the *Kuraḷ* uses the term *Nūl* in several places, and in each one of them it seems to be referring actually to the most authoritative treatise treating of the subject, at any rate, prominently it stands in one set of contexts with the sense the authoritative religious treatise of the Brāhmaṇas, the Veda. In another set of references, it seems to stand for the *Arthaśāstra*, the treatise of Kauṭilya ; at any rate, so the commentator does explain it. Therefore generally there seems to be warrant for the use of the term *Nūl* in the sense of a treatise of authority in any particular subject. The discussion occurs in connection with the composition of works of literature and what a work does actually mean. The discussion is found in the earliest and the most authoritative Tamil grammar *Tolkāppiyam* under *Sūtra* 94 of *Marabiyal* in the larger section *Poruḷ* or *Artha*. The commentater Nilakaṇṭhan of Muśiri, commenting on a work of erotics said to have been composed by no less an authority than Śiva himself, for which a commentary was made by the Tamil celebrity Nakkīrar, also does so. This commentator Nīlakaṇṭhan is said to be the twelfth in legitimate teaching succession from the original commentator, and his commentary takes up the discussion. The meaning of the Tamil word *Nūl*, is given as a treatise formed by the continuous treatment of a subject, just as a large number of pieces of cotton do get to be thrown together and twisted into a continuous thread.

Just as the skill of the hand of the workman joins together many a scattered staple of cotton in one connected thread through the skill of his workmanship, so a learned poet through his intellectual skill gathers together intricate

ideas scattered in a vast ocean of words, and strings them together in a connected work of which the divisions are *Piṇḍa*, *Paṭala*, *Ōttu* (Sanskrit *Adhikaraṇa*) and *Sūtra*. Here he offers the illuminating comment that *Nūl* in Tamil is made here to give exactly the sense of the Sanskrit word *Tantra* and is used as such in the Tamil language.

The great commentator Pērāśiriyar whose commentary on the standard grammar *Tolkāppiyam* is accepted as a high authority has a discussion on the same subject. Under *Sūtras* 478 ff. of the section on poetry (*Śeyyuḷ*) he does not use the word Tantram here as the equivalent of *Nūl*, o of even of an important section of it, although the term as such gets to be used in other connections in the course of that commentary. It is not likely that such a usage had become known to Tamil commentators without a corresponding usage, and quite an authoritative usage, among the Sanskritists. That there was such a use for the word seems to be borne out by the use of the word Tantram in the last section of *Arthaśāstra* where the final Chapter is headed 'Tantrayukti'. There the term 'Tantram' is used according to Mahāmahōpādhyāya Ganapathi Sastri as synonymous with *Arthaśāstra*. In Shama Sastri's translation this seems the meaning given to it. Only this latter seems to go a little further and makes it equivalent to treatise, not specifically *Arthaśāstra*. The name *Mahānirvāṇa Tantram* for the work, which is not Tantraic in character, seems again to support the view.

[*Reprinted from the K. B. Pathak Commemoration Volume, published by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1914.*].

Bhattavrtti.

Bhaṭṭavṛtti is usually a piece of land given to a learned Brahman to provide for his living, with a view to ensuring the pursuit of his calling, namely, the propagation of learning. A Bhaṭṭa more often coupled with the term Āchārya to show respect, making it Bhaṭṭāchārya, is of recognised use for a man of learning. The term figures frequently in proper names in Bengal now-a-days in the original sense. The name however occurs as the name of a class, generally of Vaishṇava Brahmans, in South India. The class thus represented is that of priests employed in temples for conducting worship, which necessarily implies a knowledge of the forms of worship, involving some acquaintance with various specialised branches of learning. The class is now generally perhaps more ignorant than learned except for the formal technicalities of worship they go through, more or less mechanically, although it must be said that one does come across a learned man among them here and there. The most recondite matter of their learning now-a-days is the knowledge of the Āgamas which are the regular manuals of worship. A *Bhaṭṭavṛtti* however has reference, not to this class of temple-priests, but to a man of more than ordinary learning who engages himself in propagating that learning by teaching, which, among the Brahmans at any rate, was free, and sometimes even involved the feeding and maintenance of the students. *Bhaṭṭavṛtti* therefore is a peculiar

tenure of land as the more general class of *Brahmadēya* and *Dēvadāya*. These are usually lands under the ordinary arrangement of tenancy by cultivators paying revenues to the bodies constituting the government of rural areas. The normal tenure of land would involve the payment of various dues in various classes, some of them ear-marked for particular purposes. A number of these payments would take on the character, not of payment but of return for services rendered, either by the village community as a whole, or by the government as a whole, or it may be even by an individual landlord. Payments therefore which could be regarded as return for services will be excluded from the payments, usually due to the village authorities, in the case of lands given to Brahmans, or to temples. The revenue incidences will be there, but what constitutes return for services etc., among the items of revenue, would be separated. That kind of a tenure where lands are given over to men of learning who engage themselves in teaching, is what is called *Bhaṭṭavṛtti* generally. It would be interesting to know definitely what the Bhaṭṭas were expected to be, and what they were expected to do in return for the receipt of this *vṛtti*, which would simply be provision for their maintenance.

An interesing document, datable precisely and referable to the year A.D. 999, has recently been brought to light from a village in the Chingleput District, where the record is found in a dilapidated temple, more or less completely destroyed, but has perhaps recently been restored in a poor way. The record is now found on the stones rebuilt, and on stones not in their orginal position, so that the record has

to be pieced together and cannot be read as one continuous document where it is. I am indebted to the Superindendent for Epigraphy through whose courtesy I was able to read and make out a copy for my use. The temple apparently was dedicated to Vēdanārāyaṇapperumāḷ, rather an unusual name for a deity installed in a temple. It is dated in the 14th year of a Rājakēsarivarman, distinguished by a preceding epithet imperfectly preserved, but an epithet peculiar to the great Rājarāja, the first of the name, A.D. 985-1016. The document declares itself to be promulgated by the *Sabhā* of Āniyūr, which was a rural unit by itself in the sub-division of Kaḷattūr. It refers to the gift of 12 *paṭṭis* of land. This piece of land was originally gifted to the Subrahmaṇya temple at Tiruttaṇi, and the village assembly was making an annual payment of 12 *kaḻañju* of gold. The document under reference states that the assembly took it upon themselves to pay this amount to the Tiruttaṇi temple themselves, and then transformed these 12 *paṭṭis* of land into a *Bhaṭṭavṛtti.* It was otherwise released from all kinds of payment incidental to the holding of land, and these the Bhaṭṭa was allowed to utilise for his maintenance.

The qualifications demanded of the Bhaṭṭa are laid down in the following section and are of particular interest. (1) It is laid down that he should be a man born of a Sāmavedin. He should nevertheless be learned in another Veda than his own. (2) He should not be a native of the village, and must come and settle down from another village. (3) He ought to be able to teach naturally the two Vedas, the knowledge of which is a preliminary necessity. (4) He ought further to be able to teach *Vyākaraṇa*

Aṣṭādhyāyi (Pāṇini's grammar). This is perhaps meant for an elementary grammar, or grammar taught in general. (5) He ought to be able to teach the *Pāṇinīya Vyākaraṇa*, that is the science of grammar on the system of Pāṇini. (6) He must next be able to teach *Alaṅkāra Śāstra*. He must be able to teach all these with regular commentary. (7) He should further be able to comment properly upon *Vimśad Adhyāyam Mīmāmsa Śāstram*, that is, to expound elaborately the *Mīmāmsa Śāstra*, in all its 20 chapters. (8) It is further laid down that he ought to take in four students to whom he should give one meal daily, probably the midday meal, so that they could stay all the day with him for the purpose of his teaching. He ought to teach the subject above described to these, and turn them out fully qualified in due course. This is the document so far as its substance goes.

It will be noticed that the qualifications laid down in the document are comparatively high. That the teaching of the Veda, or the two Vedas involved here, is teaching the Veda with commentary or *Vyākhyāna*. It is not merely the teaching of the Vedic recital. That Vedas were taught with commentary had already been laid down as a condition for the franchise almost a century earlier than this date, and seems to have been more or less the general practice. The teacher was not merely a teacher of the Veda which, as it is understood in modern times, would mean nothing more than the teaching of Veda for purposes of recital and no more. But the teaching laid down here is very much more than that. It should also be noted that in addition to teaching the Veda with

commentary, the teacher is expected to teach grammar, the grammar needed for general requirements. He should further be able to teach the subject on the Pāṇinīyan system as a science. Similarly he should teach *Alaṅkāra Śāstra*, poetics and rhetoric. Lastly he should be able to expound, to an equal degree of proficiency, the *Mīmāmsa Śāstra* and, what is more in it, the *Mīmāmsa Śāstra in its 20 chapters*. The last detail is of the utmost importance to the history of the *Mīmāmsa Śāstra*. It is clearly stated here that this *Mīmāmsa Śāstra* was of 20 chapters. The 20 chapters of this *Mīmāmsa Śāstra* would include the first 12 chapters which are together called *Karma Mīmāmsā*, and the last 4 chapters which are generally known by the term *Brahma Mīmāmsā*; but it also includes the four chapters in the middle. These four probably were called by another name, but is known to Hindu scholars now-a-days in the Daivi or Dēvata Kāṇḍa. These are also called Saṅkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa because a Sankarshana commented on them. That these twenty chapters constituted the *Mīmāmsā* as a whole single science, and were so regarded regularly at the time of the inscription, is important addition to our knowledge of the *Śāstra*, as recently an opinion has been expressed in a publication of the Allahabad Pāṇini Office, where the Saṅkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa is plainly stated to be a fabrication of Rāmānuja. This document is of date perhaps one generation anterior to the date of birth of Rāmānuja, and a *Mīmāmsa Śāstra* of 20 chapters was then regularly taught as such. The history of the *Mīmāmsa Śāstra* has recently been receiving attention, and a recent work* bearing on the subject shows an

* By Mr. Ramaswami Sastri of the Annamalai University.

inclination to put it in its proper perspective. This statement in an inscription of date A.D. 998–9, of the 14th year of Rājarāja Chōḷa puts it altogether beyond a doubt that the *Mīmāmsa Śāstra* was taught as a single science composed of 20 chapters, whatever divisions it might have had as a matter of teaching convenience. This record thus confirms a work called *Prapañchahṛdayam** published recently in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series by the late Mahāmahōpādhyāya Pandit Ganapati Sastri.

From what is said above, it would be clear that what is called *Bhaṭṭavṛtti* was far from being a provision for feeding or maintaining an idle Brahman, but a provision for learning, where the qualifications demanded and the work expected to be done by the beneficiary, were both high. The work to be actually done by the Bhaṭṭa was also precisely laid down, and obviously had been done actually by the teacher.

[*Reprinted from the Della Valle Poussian special Number of the Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. XVI, 1940.*]

---

* For a fuller discussion on this see *Maṇimēkhalai in its historical setting*, and note on *Mīmāmsā* pending publication in the *Woolner Commemor ation Volume*.

Vimsati-Adhyaya-Nibaddham Mimamsa-Sastram.

An inscription* recently brought to light by the Department of Epigraphy relating to the fourteenth year of Rājarāja, corresponding to a date in A.D. 999, refers to the *Mīmāmsa Śāstra* as containing *vimśati adhyāyas* (20 chapters), This interesting document has reference to the creation of a *Bhaṭṭavṛtti* (living for a learned Brahman) in the village. A *Bhaṭṭavṛtti* is the provision of a living for a Brahman whose function is to teach. In this case the duty of teaching was imposed upon this Brahman in return for the living which the village provided for him. The qualifications expected of him happen to be interesting also. He should not be a native of the village concerned. He ought to be by birth a Sāmavedin. But he ought to know and be able to teach one of the three other Vedas, the teaching of the Veda here implying the expounding of the Veda as well. He ought to be able to teach also the *Aṣṭādhyāyi* (grammar), and expound the Pāṇinīya *Vyākaraṇa*, the distinction between the two being the ordinary grammar as taught in the schools, and the expounding of the *Vyākaraṇa Śāstra* as an advanced study. He ought similarly to be able to teach *Alaṅkāra* (rhetoric), and the *Mīmāmsā* of *twenty chapters*. It should be expounded with *Vyākhyāna* (commentary). He ought to

* No. 76 of 1932-33 from Ānūr in the Chingleput District. *Vide* the latest report on *South Indian Epigraphy*. Also Editorial pages 261-64 of the *Journal of Indian History*, Vol. XV, Part 2.

take four students, and give them one meal a day in addition to the responsibility of teaching them. For the purpose of rendering this service, he was allotted the income from a particular plot of land which had otherwise been allotted to a temple, of a definite measure which is mentioned in Tamil units. The other details of the document do not concern us. We are concerned with the *Mīmāmsā* being a science of *twenty chapters*, which had to be taught and expounded as one science of twenty chapters. The actual importance of the document is that it is precisely datable and belongs to the year A.D. 999.

A Sanskrit work published by the late MM. Dr. Ganapati Sastri of Trivandrum in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, under the name *Prapañchahṛdayam*, has useful information in the chapter on the *Upangas*, the fourth chapter of the book, pages 38–42. It begins with the statement that the *Upangas* are *Mīmāmsā*, *Nyāya*, the *Purāṇas* and the *Dharma Śāstra*. Of these, *Mīmāmsā* is a science, which has for its purpose the proper exposition of the meaning of the Veda and attempts to do it by an enquiry into the actual meaning of the sentences (*Vākyārtha*) composing the Veda, leading to an understanding of the *puruṣārthas* (ends of life), which are generally taken to be four : *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kāma* and *Mōkṣa*. Then follows a statement that while the *Vēdāngas*, *Sikṣā*, *Vyākaraṇa* and *Nirkuta* explain the meaning of the words in the Veda, *Mīmāmsā* is intended to determine and explain the meaning of sentences. This science falls into two divisions on the basis of the Veda itself into the *Pūrva* and the *Uttara Kāṇḍas*. Then follows

the clear statement, that it is actually composed of twenty chapters, of which the *Pūrva Kāṇḍa* takes in the first sixteen chapters, and conducts an enquiry into the nature of *Dharma*. It is said to have been written by Jaimini. The remaining four chapters constitute the *Uttara Mīmāmsā* and explain the *Uttara Kāṇḍa* of the Veda, and conduct an enquiry into the nature of *Brahman*, and were written by Vyāsa.

Then follow details as to the commentators who wrote commentaries on these, beginning with the vast commentary *Kṛtakōṭi*, written by Bōdhāyana, and proceeds to deal historically with the subsequent commentators, apparently in the chronological order. According to this work Upavarsha abridged the vast commentary *Kṛtakōti* of Bōdhāyana. It was his successor commentator, Dēvasvāmin who, deeming the subject too vast for being effectively taught, took up the first sixteen chapters, the *Pūrva Mīmāmsā* and wrote a commentary on these chapters. He was followed by another commentator by name Bhavadāsa, whose commentary was a little more abridged than that of Dēvasvāmin. The great commentator Sabara following, divided the *Pūrva Mīmāmsā* (*Dharma Mīmāmsā*), into two, and commented on the first 12 chapters of the 16, called the *Tantra Kāṇḍa*, leaving out the second part *Śamkarṣa Kāṇḍa*, also called *Saṅkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa*. This *Kāṇḍa* was called *Dēvata Kāṇḍa* which was commented on by Samkarsha or Sankarshana. The second part of the *Mīmāmsā*, constituing the last four chapters, and called *Brahma Kāṇḍa*, was commented upon by various authors, such as Bhagavatpāda, Dharmadatta, and Bhāskara. Finding differences

of interpretation possible in the *Sabara Bhāṣya*, Bhatta Kumāriḷa and Prabhākara wrote different commentaries on the same part. Then follows an abridged exposition of the contents of the 20 chapters, including the four chapters of the so-called *Saṅkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa*, more appropriately the *Dēvata Kāṇḍa* of the *Pūrva Mīmāmsā*.

We see from this recital, as given in this book, that the *Mīmāmsā Śāstra* was one whole, the divisions, *Pūrva* and *Uttara*, being based on the subject-matter of the Veda, the interpretation of which is the subject-matter of this science, following the Vedic division of the *Pūrva* and the *Uttara Kāṇḍas*. Then follows the question of commentators. The first commentary was published by Bōdhāyana called *Kṛtakōṭi*. This latter name has remained obscure and almost unknown to modern writers on the *Mīmāmsā*. Upavarsha's work on the subject is, on the basis of this work, *Prapañchahṛdayam*, a mere abridgment of the great *vṛtti* or commentary of Bōdhāyana. The first author who really divided the subject into two parts and dealt with the parts separately is the commentator Dēvasvāmin who commented only upon the *Pūrva*, the first sixteen chapters. A similar commentary, a mere abridgment, was written by another teacher by name Bhavadāsa. It was Sabara really who took up for his commentary the first twelve chapters, known distinctly by the name *Tantra Kāṇḍa*, as distinct from the *Dēvata Kāṇḍa*, the last four chapters of the *Pūrva Mīmāmsā*. Sabara is responsible for the vogue that was given to the twelve chapters, being called *Pūrva Mīmāmsā*, and the neglect of the next four chapters, which ultimately led to the *Mīmāmsā* being regarded as two separate

sciences, *Pūrva Mīmāmsā* or simply *Mīmāmsā*, and the *Vēdānta* or *Uttara Mīmāmsā*. Bhatta Kumārila and Prabhākara commented, each in his own way, on the first twelve chapters, in criticism of Śabara; and it is the influence of the former particularly, that has made *Mīmāmsā*, in modern times, mean only the *Pūrva Mīmāmsā*.

We do not know the name of the author of the *Prapañchahṛdaya*; much less therefore, anything of his life and the period in which he lived. If we could make a guess from the similarity of the main notion that the *Mīmāmsā* is a single science of twenty chapters, the inscription would lend support to it. We may, therefore, take it that there could not be any vast difference of time between the date of the *Prapañchahṛdaya* and the inscription; it may be a number of generations. We notice in the series of commentators the name Bhagavatpāda, among the commentators on the *Brahma Kāṇḍa*. We cannot be sure that it refers to Śaṅkara. He is generally referred to as Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda, while his *Guru*, Gōvinda, is generally referred to by the name Bhagavatpāda alone. If, from this, we are to argue that the author of the *Prapañchahṛdaya* did not know, or had not heard of the *Śaṅkara Bhāṣya*, he may have lived just about the time of Śaṅkara. Whatever that be, we have the distinct piece of information from this work, that up to the period of Dēvasvāmin, *Mīmāmsā* was treated as a single science, and Dēvasvāmin's division was only a division of convenience. It is Śabara, who divided the *Pūrva* part into two, and led the way to Kumāriḷa Bhatta and Prabhākara, and the

conjoint influences of these two, much more that of the former, became responsible ultimately for the *Mīmāmsa Śāstra* being regarded as the *Pūrva Mīmāmsā* only, and the first twelve chapters being called the *Tantra Kāṇḍa.*

This position was, however, not altogether unquestioned as is clear by the fact, that the inscription referred to above, still speaks of the *Mīmāmsā* as of twenty chapters, which had to be taught as a whole by the particular Bhaṭṭa, concerned. There seems to have been a school, which still regarded the *Mīmāmsā* as one *Śāstra* and continued to teach it, as such, Naturally, of course, Rāmānuja followed, and other Vaishṇava teachers, subsequent to Rāmānuja, continued the Vaishṇava tradition, as the *Bhaṭṭavṛtti*, under reference here, is a grant made, probably to a Vaishṇava teacher to teach *Mīmāmsā* and other kindred subjects. We may perhaps call it the Vaishṇava tradition, which regarded the *Mīmāmsā* as one whole, and treated the *Saṅkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa* as no less authoritative than the other *Kāṇḍas**.

A recent investigator, who has written a work on the history of *Mīmāmsā*, calls it the history of the *Pūrva Mīmāmsa Sāstra*, and brings down that history from the beginning to the present day. In the course of the work he recognises † that the *Saṅkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa* is not apocryphal, and is genuine work forming part of the *Mīmāmsa Sāstra.*‡

* For a discussion of this and connected topics, see the author's work, *Maṇimēkhalai in its Historical Setting*, pp. 57-67.

† Mr. V. A. Ramaswami Sastri, M.A., of the Annamalai University, in his introduction to the *Tattvabindu* of Vācaspati Miśra with *Tattvavibhāvana* of *Ṛṣiputra Paramēśvara.*

‡ *Opus Cit.* pp. 2-3, and note 1 on page 13.

He quotes for authority Śabara himself referring to *Saṅkarṣa* in his commentary on XII-2, 11 "*iti Saṅkarṣē vakṣyatē*". He also refers to a commentary on the *Saṅkarṣana Kāṇḍa* by a Dēvasvāmin, a *Smṛtikāra* of a later date. He would identify this Dēvasvāmin, however, with the Dēvasvāmin, the commentator on the *Mīmāmsā* and would make him, therefore, quote from the Bhavadāsa's commentary. It is perhaps better to suspend this identification till more real evidence should be forthcoming.

Speaking of Vēdānta Dēśika and his writings on the *Mīmāmsā*, Mr. Ramaswami Sastri makes the following remarks :—

"A critic of very violent temper, he has elucidated in these works the *Siddhāntas* of the Bhāṭṭas and the Prābhākaras in many *Adhikaraṇas*, now and then criticising both. Naturally, therefore, his explanations of the *Sūtras* are not in many instances acceptable to an *orthodox* student of *Mīmāmsā*, in view of the fact that they are deviations from the *Siddhāntas* of the two great *Āchāryas* of the *Mīmāmsa Śāstra*. His aim seems to be not to explain the *Siddhāntas* of the *Mīmāmsa Śāstra*, but to attempt *a synthesis as far as possible*, of the doctrines of *the two systems of Mīmāmsā, Pūrva and Uttara*".

The italics are ours. From what has been stated above, the evolution of the study of *Mīmāmsā* would perhaps make one hesitate to accept this criticism as valid, as Vēdānta Dēśika clearly proceeds on the basis that the *Mīmāmsa Śāstra* is one whole, and ought to be understood as such, a

position not entirely of his own making.* In this connection we quote the following from the introduction to the translation of the Śābara *Bhāṣya* in the Sacred Books of the Hindus Series by Pandit Mohan Lal Sandal, and leave students of *Mīmāṃsā* to investigate the matter further, impartially :—

"This apocryphal portion is known under the name of *Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa* and is said to have been commented upon by Sabara. No commentary of Sabara has yet been found. There is no doubt that Rāmānuja has referred to *Śaṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa* while commenting upon III, Pāda 3 of the Vēdānta *Sūtras*. He quotes *nānā vā dēvatā pṛthaktvāt*; we find this *sūtra* in a mutilated form in *sūtra* 15 of Chapter XIV, Pāda 2 of *Śaṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa*. The writer of the commentary called Vēdāntapradīpa, who belongs to that school, has also referred to it. It cannot be said with certainty that the *Śaṅkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa* or *Śaṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa*, referred to by the Rāmānuja School of commentators, is the same as published in the *Pandit*, the monthly publication of the Benares Sanskrit College. What puts one in doubt is that Rāmānuja has referred to *Bōdhāyanavṛtti*, has quoted in the commentary on *Sūtra* I of the Vēdānta *Sūtra*, "*samhitamētacchārīrakam Jaiminīyēna ṣōḍaśalakṣanēnēti śāstraikatvasiddhiḥ*" (=this *Śārīraka Śāstra* has been collected by Jaimini and is characterised with sixteen chapters and is therefore one *Śāstra*), has said that by virtue of the *Ṣaṭkas* and chapters there is a division of the anterior and posterior *Mīmāmsās*, and has quoted the first *Sūtra* of the *Mīmāmsā* and the last *Sūtra* of the Vēdānta in order to show that the two together form one body of the *Śāstra*".

* *Mīmāmsa Pāduka* and Sēśvara *Mīmāmsā*.

He goes further and says that "no other author has made any mention or reference to *Śaṅkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa*, and that the *Śaṅkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa* was once regarded a separate treatise, but not a part of Jaimini's *Mīmāṃsā* consisting of 12 chapters." It formed a separate book and was passed on as a genuine work of Jaimini *by interested persons.* Rāmānuja was born in 1127 * A.C.; we find Sankarshana referred to by him *for the first time.* Madhusūdana Sarasvati gave a detailed account of it. "He comes to the conclusion, after mentioning that Abul Fazal does not mention it". "I am of opinion that *Śaṅkarṣaṇa* is a spurious work. Further I am of opinion that the work, as it exists now in the present form, is either the work of Khanḍadēva or of Bhāskara". The *Śaṅkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa* was commented upon by a Dēvasvāmin, who lived about A.D. 1,000 and constitutes an important source for reconstructing the *Sūtras*, and this *Bhāṣya* is preserved in manuscript in the Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts † and the Adyar Libraries. The fact that post-Śābara writers, following his *Bhāṣya* of the *Pūrva Mīmāṃsā*, do not mention it, cannot be held to demonstrate that the *Śaṅkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa* is a forgery. Rāmānuja certainly was not the first to mention the *Śaṅkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa* as others before him had done it, namely, Śabara himself, as was pointed out above, and Rāmānuja had predecessors in the system. It is too much of an order to prove that the *Śaṅkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa* was the

* This is much nearer the date of his death than of his birth, although it is near enough to the date given by Professor Macdonnell in his work on *India's Past*.

† See page, 58 of Mr. V. A. Ramaswami Sastri's *Tattvabindu*, and footnote 3.

work of either Khaṇḍadēva, the contemporary of Shah Jahan, or Bhāskara, as commentaries on the *Śaṅkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa*, ascribed to Upavarsha, Dēvasvāmin, Bhavadāsa. Rājacūdāmaṇi Dīkshita and Bhāskararāya Makhin* are under reference. But the whole problem is involved in the larger question, as we have indicated above, that the *Mīmāmsa Śāstra* is one science of twenty chapters, of which the first twelve constitute the *Tantra Kāṇḍa*, the next four the *Dēvata Kāṇḍa*, and the next four the *Brahma Kāṇḍa*. The authorities quoted above for this, in chronological order ought to be enough to overthrow the position taken by the late Pandit, the translator of the Śābara *Bhāṣya* who obviously had no knowledge of South Indian Sanskrit literature bearing upon the question. The next point in Rāmānuja's reference to Bōdhāyana-*Vṛtti* makes Rāmānuja suspect in his estimation. But unfortunately for him, however, Bōdhāyana's *Vṛtti* is, as has been shown above, under reference in other writers, anterior to Rāmānuja, and cannot, therefore be so lightly dismissed; the more so, if the commentary of Bōdhāyana is identical with *Kṛtakōṭi*. The commentary *Kāśika* on the *Ślōkavārttika* of *Sucaritamiśra* makes a reference to Kṛtakōṭi and characterises him as a follower of the *Pārāśaryamata*.† So the late Pandit's position needs radical revision.

The above brief survey makes it clear that the subject of the history of the *Mīmāmsā* requires to be made, by those specifically qualified, on a wider plan, taking the different systems together, and working towards an

* *Opus Cit.* note above; p. 13.

† See *Maṇimēkhalai in its Historical Setting*, p. 65.

unbiased general conclusion, leaving aside the affiliation to schools of philosophy and sects, at least for the purpose of this investigation. We believe there is a clear case for this in the details given above, and, that, at one time, at any rate, the science of *Mīmāṃsā* was a single one, and that it branched off into two afterwards, obviously as a matter of educational convenience. Possibly other influences intervened to make for the separation of the system such as that of Buddhism. The writer of the note on the *Śabda-kalpadruma* throws out a hint that the *Śaṅkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa* of the *Pūrva Mīmāṃsā* was omitted, because it treats of *upāsana*; but he does not quote his authority. It seems to be quite a plausible explanation, and, if that is so, the responsibility for the division may be that of Śabara and his followers, such as Kumārila and others. Whether that is so, would be worth while inquiring into. In any case, we believe, a case has been made out above for the view, that the *Mīmāṃsā* is a unitary science, and continued as such, not only down to the days of Rāmānuja, but further down to the days of Vēdānta Dēśika (and later to modern times), who makes a serious effort to rehabilitate the view, that had fallen into some little neglect. We would, therefore, commend the problem for further investigation with a view to the real history of the *Mīmāṃsā*. This investigation ought to take in both the northern and the southern literature, the *advaitic*, as well as the other schools of thought, for anything like a correct and a generally acceptable conclusion.

[*Reprinted from the Woolner Commemoration Volume, published in Lahore 1940.*]

An Iconographic Note.

The illustration, shows a sculpture in low relief on a side wall of the Hazāra Rāmasvāmi Temple in the Hindu imperial capital of Vijayanagar, now the ruins of Hampi, in the Bellary District of the Madras Presidency. Being in low relief and somewhat weather-beaten, it does not catch the eye of the visitor readily and is oftentimes not noticed. I am indebted to my friend Professor T. Ekambaram, Head of the Botany Department of the Presidency College, Madras, who brought the photograph to me. My friend had apparently no difficulty in seeing in this sculpture a representation of that aspect of Krishṇa called Vēṇu-Gōpāla, Gōpāla playing on the flute. In other localities of its provenance however, a representation of this form of Krishṇa is called Gāna-Gōpāla and Madana-Gōpāla alternatively. If we should neglect for a moment the three extra hands on either side, and could visualise the image

playing on the flute as it is, with only the two hands, we shall have an exact idea of the representation generally of Krishṇa, the flute-player. That is the ordinarily prevalent form with only two hands holding the flute and applying it to the lips, the left leg planted firmly on the ground, the right leg placed obliquely across it as in this image, the dress and decoration being about the same. Two ladies also stand, one on each side as in this case generally, sometimes holding the *chowri*, sometimes playing musical instruments to accompany. The cows when they are in a pair are made to stand one each side facing forward. If it is a single one, it stands across just behind Vēṇu-Gōpāla. Such a picture would leave absolutely no doubt in the mind of one who sees it as that of Krishṇa, the flute-player. But the extra hands, three on each side in series, are a very unusual form for Vēṇu-Gōpāla.

While as we stated above, the two hands holding the flute are the normal feature of this image, Krishṇa is sometimes exhibited, even in this form, with four hands, the two extra hands holding the characteristic weapons of Vishṇu, the '*śaṅkha*' (conch) in the left hand, and the '*cakra*' (the discus) in the right. But a Krishṇa image with more hands than four is comparatively rare, though not altogether impossible or unavailable.*

* There is one instance, at any rate, of this Gāna-Gōpāla in Tenkāśi, reproduced as Madana-Gōpāla, Pl. LXIII of Gopinatha Rao's Hindu Iconography (facing p. 210, Vol. I, Part i,); the cows and the ladies are absent, perhaps for the reason that there was no room, otherwise Vēṇu-Gōpāla is quite similar. There are the eight hands, the extra six hands are disposed differently as will be noticed. They are not in series as in the instance above, but held down in different

In Conjivaram there is a shrine dedicated to Vishṇu and generally known as '*Aṣṭa Bhujam*' (eight hands) as if the eight hands were an extraordinary feature of the Vishṇu-deity in the shrine. Popularly the deity in this shrine, which is still in use as a place of worship, is called '*Cakrarāyar*', the lord, the Discus of Vishṇu. This popular name perhaps hides a recondite truth. The *cakra* is described in

---

degrees of inclination from the shoulder. The weapons in the three right hands are, according to Gopinatha Rao, '*padma*' (lotus) in the lowest hand, the '*paraśu*' (battle axe,) in the hand next above, and '*cakra*' (discus) in the hand held vertically above. In the corresponding three hands on the left are the bow, which Gopinatha Rao calls the sugarcane bow, emblematic of Kāma. Then what Gopinatha Rao calls '*pāśa*' (the rope) which does not appear quite so clearly in the block, and '*śaṅkha*' above. These six are of course in addition to the two holding the flute, held up to the lips. In regard to the bow of sugarcane and the arrow of flowers, which here could only be taken to be the '*padma*', which certainly is not regarded as an arrow, but is generally one of the articles characteristic of Vishṇu and held in the lowest right hand whether the number of hands be four or more than four; when there is the bow in the left, there ought to be an arrow in the corresponding right hand; and if we should accept the analogy to Kāma or Cupid, the lotus may serve the purpose. A lotus is one of the five flowers which are said to constitute the five flowery arrows of Cupid. Whatever that detail be, our purpose here is to indicate that the dispositiou of the extra hands here is again a normal disposition. By normal disposition we mean that that is the general way in which the hands are disposed, with different degrees of variation in the relative positions of these, in the generality of images of Vishṇu with four hands or eight. But the extra hands in series as in the picture above is unusual. I am informed however, that there is a similar representation of Vēṇu-Gōpāla on one of the pillars in the great Vishṇu temple at Little Conjivaram dedicated to Varadarāja. Apart from this other instance, I have not come across an image with the arms dispsoed in this fashion..

Āgamāik literature as *Sahasrāra*, with a thousand spokes. But when it comes to a question of practical application, such as having to draw it on the ground, or in powder, for the purposes of mystic worship, it is generally drawn eight-limbed ; and gods in whatever aspect or form have to be invoked into this circle of eight limbs, and then it is that one is entitled to worship Him. The name *Cakrarāyar* therefore seems to indicate that there is a *cakra*, a mystic figure of this kind exhibited either just behind the image, or making the image stand on it, hence the popular name. But in the Hampi illustration we are exhibiting now, one notices just at the back of the figure a representation of a blossomed lotus, which is just another form of the mystic *cakra*, on which the Lord has to be invoked for purposes of worship. In prescribing the methods of worship one often comes upon 'āgamāik' texts which prescribe the drawing of a lotus with petals in full blossom, the god's presence being invoked on the pericarp, and the various minor gods being placed on the petals and other surrounding parts. But where a mystic '*japa*' or prayer in concentration, has to be offered, letters peculiar to the gods and goddesses are inserted in the various petals of the flowered lotus. It is that lotus that is here exhibited in the picture from Hampi. The various weapons are the following in series ; one of the extra right hands has a lotus ; the next one a small sword ; the next one has a discus. Across on the other side is a conch or '*śaṅkha*' ; then the '*aṅkuśa*,' the elephant-goad, and next the '*pāśa*' or rope tied up in a loop, the pecularity of the disposition of the hands still remaining. The explanation of this peculiar representation of one of the very popular aspects of Vishṇu is perhaps in the fact that it

is a representation of a recondite form for worship with a definite object. It is laid down that, if one wishes to worship for earthly good, the object to be worshipped is an '*apara*' god, that is an earthly representation of god. If it is the ultimate bliss or salvation that is wanted, the form of god to be worshipped is the '*para*' form, God in the eternal ineffable form has to be invoked. In such a case, that is, in the former case, Vishṇu in whatever aspect, ought to be represented with eight hands, with his vehicle, with all his weapons and the attendant deities. He must be depicted of a deep blue colour, with red lotus eyes, and a cloth of yellow colour. He ought to be worshipped by being placed upon a red lotus. He should be given in his eight hands, the *śaṅkha*, *cakra*, *gadā*, *padma*, *khaḍga*, *khēṭa*, *śara* and *dhanus*; conch, discus, mace, lotus, sword, shield, arrow and the bow. For convenience of reference, I have set down the text below taken from the *Paramasamhitā*, Chapter III, ślōkas 12 and 13,* and Chapter IV, ślokas 78 and 81†.

It will thus be seen that the carving here, though presented more or less in secular form and unshrined, is perhaps meant to be a representation of one aspect of

* Udayāyāparaḥ-pūjyaḥ nirvāṇāya paraḥ pumān/ Tatrāṣṭabhujamākāram kalpayitvā savāhanam// III. 12. Sāyudham saparivāramca udayārttī prapūjayēt/ Mahēndra-nīla saṅkāśam padmākṣam pīta vāsasam// III. 13. Aṣṭabāhustadārādhya rakta padmē Janārdanaḥ/ Vāhanēnāyudhaiścāpi parivāraiśca sambhṛtaḥ// IV. 78. Śaṅkham, Cakram, Gadā, Padmam, Khaḍgam, Khēṭam, Śaram, Dhanuḥ/ Ityāyudhāni Dēvasya karēṣvaṣṭasu Padmaja// IV. 81.

† Gaikwad's Sanskrit Series Vol. LXXXVI, with an English translation.

Krishṇa, the flute-player, as he should be worshipped for gaining prosperity.

Before concluding we may state it generally that eight-handed figures of Vishṇu conform more or less to the rule laid down above, but with minor variations to suit circumstances, which variations should not be held to break the general norm. The first and foremost consideration is what purpose the aspect of Vishṇu worshipped is intended to serve. In the eight-handed Vishṇu alluded to above in the shrine of Aṣṭabhujam in Conjivaram, the disposition of the hands and weapons happens to be as in the generality of cases. The hands are placed at various angles pendant from the shoulder. On the right side the '*cakra*' (discus), '*bāṇa*' (arrow), apparently erroneous for '*khaḍga*', '*padma*' (lotus) and '*śara*' (arrow): on the left side '*śaṅkha*' (conch), '*cāpa*' (bow) '*khēṭa*' (shield) and '*gadā*' (mace). It will be seen that the normal prescription for the right hand is '*cakra*', '*gadā*', '*padma*', '*khaḍga*'; and the normal for the left hand are the '*śaṅkha*, '*khēṭa*', '*śara*' and '*dhanus*', if we take the order of recital in the *Parama-samhitā* to be the prescribed order. But it apparently is not, as the bow and the arrow could not be on the same side. Usually the '*śara*' or arrow is placed in the right hand, the '*cāpa*' or bow in the left. In the case of the Aṣṭabhuja image, the aspect of Vishṇu represented demands the bow and the arrow should be in the left and right principal hands, that is, generally the lowest; and since in the right hands happen to be placed here the '*bāṇa*' and the '*śara*' together, the '*bāṇa*' ought to be held to represent a sword or '*khaḍga*.' Vishṇu is supposed to have appeared there to

protect Brahmā's great penance. Brahmā was performing a great '*yajña*' (sacrifice) in the locality to bring down on earth god Varadarāja, the deity in the Vishṇu temple. His '*yajña*' was being very badly disturbed by hostile genii as his penance was waxing hotter and hotter. So thunder and rain, floods and disturbances of a fearsome kind were made to occur, and, to protect Brahmā in this condition, Vishṇu is said to have appeared. The form described is generally like Rāma, but with eight hands generally, Rāma having only two with bow and arrow. So the bow and the arrow must be provided and placed in the principal hands, the other hands holding the remaining weapons. A similar appearance is called for where the representation in image form is Vishṇu as he presented himself on the occasion of saving the elephant from the clutches of the crocodile, '*Gajēndramōkṣa*,' as it is called. But this standard disposition of the hands and the distribution of the weapons is varied to suit each particular aspect of Vishṇu. By way of illustration reference may be made to the representation of Vishṇu as Vāmana-Trivikrama,* the same Trivikrama in Bādāmi,† and the representation in Ellora.‡

---

* One in Mahābalipuram *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XVIII, Supplement. plate 17; also Volume I, Part i, plate 49 of Gopinatha Rao's Hindu Iconography.

† Illustrated in Gopinatha Rao's book, pl. 50.

‡ *Ibid.* pl. 51. It will be noticed readily that in the first, two hands are left free, the right hand held up as if to assure the gods of Trivikrama's success against Bali. The corresponding left hands is stretched out to point to the uplifted left foot as the refuge for all seeking it (*abhaya*). Then there are the discus, the mace and the sword in the right hands, the conch, the shield, and the bow in the left hand. I suspect what Mr. Gopinatha Rao calls a '*gadā*' is really the

One point of importance in respect of these three representations is that the raised leg is in different positions in these cases. In the Mahābalipuram image it is lifted up to the shoulder. That is one permissible form, and Brahmā in heaven is there exhibited as washing the feet with water from his '*kamaṇḍalu*.' In the case of the other two, the left foot is raised only a part of the way up, going up to the navel, as is described in the second form. Then it is held to be only measuring the space above the earth, not the heavens. In the third case, which is permissible, but not generally found, this left leg is raised only up to the height of the knee. This is unusual. In regard to the sword in the first two cases, it is held uplifted though in

---

lotus which takes the place of the '*śara*' when it is actually present, though the disposition of the fingers and the hand would preclude such an assumption. In this case, we shall have to take it that the '*cāpa*' is in the corresponding left hand to that of the '*śara*.' In the Bādāmī Cave illustration there surely is on the right hand '*khaḍga*' in the topmost hand, the discus in the next one just behind it, the arrow in the next one, and the mace in the lowest one. On the left side is the conch. The hand answering to the sword hand seems to be bare and may have to be held as the hand holding the shield by the disposition of the fingers. Next is the hand pointing to the left foot, one hand between holding the bow. Burgess describes the weapons of this as the discus, the sword, the mace or the club, the arrow; in the right hands, the conch, the bow on the left, and he speaks of a bare hand "with the fourth arm that side, he points to a round grim face, perhaps Rāhu." Burgess calls the moon Rāhu, and what the hand actually points to is the uplifted foot in substitution as in the previous case for the '*abhaya*' pose of that hand. A similar difference is noticeable in regard to this particular in the Ellora Trivikrama in respect of the disposition of the weapons. But the hand without the weapons clearly shows that the finger here is pointing to the uplifted foot.

slightly different dispositions, and in the third, it is held across the body. Such minor variations seem permissible notwithstanding the prescription in authoritative texts. In none of these forms, however, are the hands disposed of in series as in the illustration from Hampi, and that still constitutes its peculiar feature.

[*Reprinted from Ananda Coomaraswamy Volume of the Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art, 1937.*]

Panchavara Variyam.

The term *pañchavāra vāriyam* is frequently met with in South Indian inscriptions. It generally occurs among the various assemblies, big and small, which went to constitute the government of rural divisions in Tamil India. From the contexts in which the term occurs, and from association with terms of similar application, it is generally translated as '*Pañchavāram* Committee,' a confession that the *pañchavāram* part of the term is not understood, perhaps not even understandable. The term 'committee' as the equivalent of *vāryiam* we shall discuss presently. The largest number of these committees that happen to be mentioned together occurs in No. 156 of Volume III of the *South Indian Inscriptions*, at Tiruppārkkaḍal in the North Arcot district. The assemblies mentioned are the following :—

(1) *Samvatsara vāriyam;*	(5) *Pañchavāra vāriyam;*
(2) *Tōṭṭa vāriyam ;*	(6) *Kaṇakku vāriyam ;*
(3) *Ēri vāriyam ;*	(7) *Kaliṅgu vāriyam ;*
(4) *Kaḻani vāriyam ;*	(8) *Taḍivaḻi vāriyam.*

Among these are included the great people of Śrī Vaḍavīra Nāraṇam, and following these are the Bhaṭṭas. All these, together with other citizens, constituted the *Mahā Sabhā*, or the great assembly, of the village, and the meeting under reference also contained the governor of the village,

Pallavan Brahmāda Araiyan, and the superintendent, Arumbā Kīlān.

In this recital, it will be seen, there are two classes of people referred to, viz., (1) the *Bhaṭṭas* or learned Brahmans, a group by itself, and (2) the great ones of Śrī Vaḍavīra Nāraṇam, which would simply mean the inhabitants, or the residents, of the part or ward of the town which went by the name Vaḍavīra Nāraṇam. In these two cases, apparently, it is the whole body of the people concerned that are under reference. In the case of the other eight, it seems to be that the bodies were constituted, as usual, by a process of lot and election combined, for various purposes. The first one was entrusted with the general management of the affairs of the village for the year. The second, similarly, had the management of the gardens of the village; the third, the irrigation tanks; the fourth, the fields; the fifth is the *pañchavāra vāriyam*; the sixth had the management of the accounts of the village; the seventh, of the sluices; and the eighth was the *taḍivaḻi vāriyam*, which ought to be translated as the Roads Committee, but is rendered as the 'great men of the field supervision.' This seems inappropriate, as there is the *kaḻani-vāriyam* for the fields, whereas *vaḻi* would mean 'the way,' and *taḍi vaḻi* perhaps stands for 'straight roads,' as they are usually stated to be of a width of so many rods (*taḍi*).

From this recital it becomes clear that the common affix to these terms, *vāriyam*, has a meaning as in the similar very familiar Tamil compound *vāśivāriyan*, *vāśivāriyan* being the equivalent of the Sanskrit *aśvadamanaka*, one who trains and controls horses, or, in one

word, trainer. So it would be safe to translate the term *vāriyam* by the English general term 'management.' The *pañchavāra vāriyam* therefore must be a committee appointed for the management of something on the analogy of the other seven, of which, as we see, the first constituted the general management for the year, whereas the other six committees are committees appointed for the management of particular branches of administration.

The term *vāriyam* however has another significance, which ought to be noted here, namely, 'president' or 'chairman.' In the 'circular-inscriptions' issued by Parāntaka laying down the regulations for the election and constitution of the bodies composing the government of a village, the circular is said to have been presented to the assembly or the *sabhā* of the village, of Uttaramērūr by a divisional officer of consequence, who is said in the inscriptions to have acted as the *vāriyam* (*vāriyam āha*). The Government Epigraphist of the day, the late Rai Bahadur Venkayya. translated the words in the *A.S.R.* for the year 1904–05 (where he has translated the two important documents) as 'the local governor being present'. He has also doubtingly suggested, "and convening?". *Vāriyam āha* cannot be explained as denoting mere presence, having regard to the general significance of the term *vāriyam* indicated above, viz., that of management. In those two documents clearly the officer concerned was not merely present, but actually conducted the assembly as the representative of the king. He would therefore be one who presided over the assembly and managed the business by conducting the meeting satisfactorily. In the expression

pañchavāra vāriyam, therefore, the term *vāriyam* may stand for either a managing committee of a few, or an individual chairman who managed the business of a body.

In regard to *pañchavāra vāriyam*, however, there must be a similar significance. In the same village are other records which refer to a few other bodies* like this. Of these, five are mentioned. There is a body or a committee for the supervision of *kuḍumbu* or, as it is translated, 'wards.' This is a new body, and there is a body of men looking after ascetics (*udāsīnas*). This again is a new body. There is a body which is simply described as a body of 200. Nothing is added by way of explaining what the 200 stood for, and how that body of 200 came to be constituted. The other two mentioned are already found in the list above. So there are in all eleven such bodies, of which the *pañchavāra vāriyam* is one.

This body is generally referred to, wherever it occurs, as the '*Pañchavāram* Committee,' and nothing further is stated as to what it might actually connote, or how that name came to be given to that body. There is one reference, however, which seems to give the clue to this. In connection with the measuring of grain, one comes across a reference to the *pañchavāram*-measure, which would indicate that the measures were subject to regulation by

* These additional bodies, and in fact some of the eight already quoted, are found in a number of records, of which it is only one or two that have been so far published. I examined the transcripts in the Epigraphist's Office, through the courtesy of my friend, Mr. K.V. Subramaniya Aiyar, B.A., Assistant Superintendent for Epigraphy, who allowed me to examine the documents and read through them. I acknowledge his courtesy with pleasure and gratitude.

this *Panchavāram* Committee. Perhaps from this the inference would be permissible that this committee had the supervision and regulation of such matters as measures, weights, etc., somewhat like a municipal corporation in these general functions. If that is so, it becomes clear that it is all the more important we should know what the *pañchavāram* was, and how it came to be constituted.

Pañcha, of course, may be translated as five, and probably it is five. Here, as in fact elsewhere, e.g., in the term *pañchāyat*, it seems loosely to stand for a body of five, though the specific significance of the number has been lost, and people speak, in these days, often of a single man constituting a *pañchāyat* in the sense of the Sanskrit term *madhyasta*, or an umpire. But what is the term *vāram?* This term occurs in other contexts, as pointed out by the late Professor Kielhorn, e.g., in the *Siyaḍoni* inscription, where the term occurs several times in the compound *vāra-mukha* or *vāra-mukhya*. He refers also to the term *vāra-gōṣṭi* occurring in some of the Eastern Chāḷukya grants, and has even attempted to identify the *vāra-gōṣṭi* with the *pañcha-vāram*, and going further, tried to identify the term *pañchavārīm*, occurring in the same inscriptions, with this *pañchavāram*.* But the term *vāram* in its general application, as in *vāra-mukha* or *-mukhya*, is nothing more than *gaṇa* (a 'group' or 'body'). The Sanskrit lexicon *Vaijayanti* gives the term *vāra* as a synonym of *gaṇa*,† which would mean a 'body,' and that seems the meaning in which the term occurs in *pañchavāra-*

* *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. V, No. 16-E; also note 7 on p. 138 of the same Volume.

† *Vide* Oppert's Edition, p. 186.

vāriyam. The term would then mean the managing bodies of five groups of people, thereby indicating that in the various committees and bodies in whom vested the administration of the rural area, there were five groups that constituted bodies of people, rather than Committees of management consisting of a smaller number, the usual number being either six or twelve according to the character of the particular committee. Hence, the *pañchavāra vāriyam* would mean a body of management constituted out of five groups or bodies of people, for which we have the analogy of the 200 in the village, "the great men numbering 200," of one of these inscriptions; and the *Bhaṭṭas*, who must have been numerous, the number of learned Brahmans in a village constituting a body by itself. Then for certain purposes there were the *ūrōm*, the inhabitants of the whole village, the *nāṭṭōm* the representatives that constituted the government of the *nāḍu* or larger division, and the *nagarattār*, or the citizens. It would be in keeping with such a constitution as this that they should have the general management of the affairs of the village, such as the regulation of weights and measures, and other such matters of general administration. *Vāram*, therefore, seems a term used merely to indicate a group or body of people, the *pañchavāra vāriyam* meaning as a whole, therefore, the management consisting of representatives of five groups of people.

There is evidence for this suggestion in the ordinary Tamil expression *aim perum kuḻu*, the *five great bodies* which formed one of the bodies of ministers, who ought to be consulted and whose advice had to be acted up to by the

ruler. There are two such groups that are mentioned among those in immediate attendance upon the king, and they are the five great groups mentioned above, and the eight bodies who constituted the *parijanam*, the people in immediate attendance upon the king. The king's court consisted of these two bodies, of which the five that have been referred to above consisted of the *mahājana* (people in general), *pārpār* (Brahmans or *Bhaṭṭas* of the inscriptions), *maruttar* (physicians), *nimittar* (astrologers), and *amaicchar* (ministers, the body that constituted the Council as a whole). Another definition of this group of five, recites among them the ministers, priests, commanders of the army, ambassadors and the body of spies. While the second interpretation would seem to me unsuitable for explaining *pañchavāra vāriyam* as constituting a body in the government organisation of a rural unit, the first interpretation, or something analogous to it, seems legitimate, knowing as we do that the administration of a rural locality considered actually of a certain number of committees of twelve or six members according to the character of the committee. While these smaller committees were intended for carrying on the actual administration, they had behind them larger bodies of people from whom they drew their authority; and these bodies were divided into groups for definite purposes. These groups, among whom five were of general importance, such as the whole body of learned Brahmans or *Bhaṭṭas*, and the whole body of people other than Brahmans, might have been represented by committees, or even individuals, for certain purposes; and the committees or the individual representatives of the five of these groups that were concerned with the administration

as a whole, must have constituted the *pañchavāra vāriyam*; and they must therefore have had powers of general administration and control, which the reference to a *pañcha-vāram* measure' seems to indicate.

Before passing on, we ought to consider the suggestion made by Kielhorn on the basis of the Eastern Chāḷukya grants. The whole of Kielhorn's position is contained in the note above referred to. The inscriptions refer to a family of learned Brahmans, whose children and grandchildren attained to such facility and excellence, even as boys, in speaking and recitation that they were held in reverence by the great people of the community. That is the general sense of the *ślōka* which occurs in two variant forms in the two grants, in both of which the term *vāra-gōṣṭi* occurs. After drawing attention to the similarity between the two passages, Kielhorn remarks: " *Vāra* here and in *Pañcha Vārī* probably denotes the number of a committee; the word occurs, by itself, and in *Vāra Pramukha*, in an apparently similar sense in the Siyadoni inscription, *Epigraphica Indica*, Vol. I, p. 173. The meaning of *Pañchavārī* is similar to that of the more common *Pañchakula*. Compare with it also the word *Pañchāli* in line 16 in the Nepalese inscription in the *Indian Antiquary*, Volume IX, page 173."

The *ślōkas* under reference are :—

1. *Yat putra pō(pau)tr(ā) Vaṭavō Vāra gōshṭishu Vāgminaḥ* |
Pañchavārī(ṁ) samāpayya sampūjyantē mahājanaiḥ ‖ (8)
Ep. Ind., V, 16-E.)

2. *Yat putra pautrāḥ paṭavō vāra goshṭishu*
Agrahārāgra(pū)j(ān)ām āpnuvanti paramparām (6).

(*S. I. I.*, I., No. 37.)

The two *ślōkas*, notwithstanding variety in expression, seem intended to convey the same meaning, and to refer to the same ceremonial excellence, which the particular family of Brahmans had attained by their extraordinary ability. While in the one record (the British Museum Plates) occurs the expression *Pañchavārīm samāpayya sampūjyantē mahājanaiḥ*, in the corresponding place in the other *ślōkas* occurs the expression *Agrahāra agra-pūjānām āpnavanti paramparām*. The latter would simply mean that they became entitled to reverential treatment as the best, or the first, by the inhabitants of the Brahman settlements. The sense of the former passage where the term *pañchavārī* occurs must be exactly the same. *Pañchavārī* therefore seems to mean water given for five purposes: (1) water for washing one's hands, (2) water for washing one's feet, (3) water given after the guest had been seated to clean his hands, (4) water for the guest to sprinkle over himself, and (5) water to sip, a ceremonial presentation of water usually for very highly respected guests. This would be a kind of treatment included in the term *agra pūjā*, respectful treatment as the first among the Brahmans. Therefore *pañchavārī* would mean merely water given for the five ablutions, and may be dismissed as having no analogy to the *pañchavāram*.

The other term to which Kielhorn's note makes reference is *vāra-gōṣṭi*. It occurs in the context where the persons concerned exhibited capacity for expression, while yet they were bachelors undergoing education, in the *vāra-gōṣṭi*. *Vāra-gōṣṭi* may, therefore, simply mean an assembly of learned Brahmans. The exhibition of elocution is not made in mere general assemblies of Brahmans. They must have been made in assemblies of people who were acknowledged experts in the chanting and recital of the Veda and *Vaidic* texts. *Vāra-gōṣṭi* probably there means the assembly of learned Brahmans for reciting the Vedas, where these young men exhibited excellence as the best reciters among them all. They had shown such proficiency that they were accorded the deferential treatment indicated in the following passage :—

Yad grihā(thi ?)ti-pūja(yām padā pra)-
kshāḷanāmbasā ।
Ajiram karddhamībhūtam punāty āsaptamam
kulam ॥

(*Ep. Ind.*, V, 16-E. p. 137.)

[Kielhorn's translation of *ślōkas* 6-8 is given below for comparative reference :—

> " His son, again is Viddamayya, a student of the *kramapāṭa*, eminent in religious learning and full of manliness ; *whose hospitality purifies the family to the seventh generation* ; whose sons and grandsons, youths eloquent at *committee assemblies*, are honoured by the chief people who have made them *serve on the committee of five*."]

That this was the actual meaning appears again from an analogous expression, though in an entirely secular context. The word *vāram* occurs in the sense of singing by turns. In Indian music, when an expert renders music, he goes a certain way in the performance, when an assistant or a collaborator takes it up by way of relief, and carries on for a considerable time. Then the expert takes up again, to be again followed by the other. This method of affording relief to the principal performer is more necessary in the case of a dancing woman who sings while performing the dance. For this purpose dancing women, who were experts in their days, but who have grown too old for the work, are generally employed; and these women take up the refrain and continue the singing. This practice is called in Tamil *vāram pāḍudal*, the act of singing in turn. Exactly the same procedure is followed in Veda or *mantra*-chanting: a passage is chanted by one set, is taken up by another, then resumed by the first batch, to be followed by the next, and so on.* This may be the *vāra*, or, in modern language, *santhe*, recital by turns. *Vāra-gōṣṭi* may therefore mean special assemblies held for Vedic chants and the reference to the excellence of these youths, while yet they were undergoing education, would be pointless unless it be that they showed such exceptional precocity or talent as to merit special commendation in an assembly of acknowledged experts. It is the sense of chanting alternately or singing by turn in *gōṣṭi* in the presence of God; *Tēvāram* being the name given to the Śaiva canonical poems of the 63

***Śilappadhikāram* III, ll. 136-37 and l. 153, and references in the following books.

devotees, which the Śaivas chant nowadays in a body, though not exactly by turns like the chanters of the Veda. If this be the sense of the term *vāra-gōṣṭi*, it would be something different from the word *vāra* in *pañchavāram*, or in *vāra pramukha*. *Vāram* in this context is nothing more than a *gaṇa* or body, and it is in that sense that we shall have to interpret the term in *pañchavāra vāriyam*, the management or representatives of five bodies of people, whose functions lay in controlling the general affairs of a rural area.

[*Paper presented to the XXVIIIth International Congress of Orientalists, Leiden. Reprinted from the Indian Antiquary, Vol. LXI, 1932.*]

The Agnikula; the Fire-Race.

In one of his interesting contributions entitled "*Some Problems of Ancient Indian History*," published in the *Journal* of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1905, p. 1 ff., Dr. Hoernle regards the Paramāra Rājputs as the only family which laid claim to belong to *the Agnikula or Fire-Race* before the time of the poet Chand (*loc. cit.* p. 20), and, so far, the evidence all seems to point to any such claim being not found earlier than the middle of the eleventh century. That, however, does not preclude an earlier existence of the legend. It would be interesting, therefore, if the legend could be traced to an earlier period than that of the Paramāras of Mālwā. In the early classical literature of the Tamils, there is a reference to this same legend, and there appears to have been in that part of India a family of ancient chiefs who claimed descent from the Sacrificial Fire.

There have been *in the Tamil land* a certain number of chiefs, whose names have been handed down to posterity as the Last Seven Patrons of Letters, the patron *par excellence* among them having been *Pāri of Paṟambunāḍu*. This chief had a life-long friend in the person of a highly esteemed Brahman, *Kapilar*, who was a poet *sui generis* in a particular department of the poetical art. "The three crowned kings of the south,"—the Cēra, the Chōḻa, and the Pāṇḍya,—growing jealous of the power and prosperity of

Pāri as a patron of poets, laid siege conjointly to his hill-fort, Muḷḷūr. Pāri having fallen a victim to this combination, it fell to the lot of his Brahman friend to get his daughters suitably married, to bring about acceptable marriages being one of the six special duties of Brahmans in the social system. He therefore took the girls over successively to two chiefs, Vichchikkōn and Puli Kaḍi Māl Iṛungōvēḷ of Aṛayam. This latter chief is addressed by the poet in these terms :—" Having come out of *the sacrificial fire-pit of the Rishi*,—having ruled over the camp of Dvārapati, whose high walls looked as though they were built of copper,—having come after forty-nine generations of patrons never disgusted with giving,—thou art the patron among patrons."* The allusion to the coming out of the sacrificial fire of the sage cannot but refer to the same incident as the other versions discussed by Dr. Hoernle. The chief thus addressed was a petty chief of a place called *Aṛayam*, composed of the smaller and the larger cities of that name, in the western hill-country, somewhere in the regions of the Western Ghats in the south of Mysore.

The more important question, exactly relevant to the discussion, is :—*What is the time of this author and his hero?* This has, so far, reference to times anterior to epigraphical records, and has therefore to be considered on literary data alone. This poet, Kapilar, is connected with a number of chiefs and kings, and is one of a galaxy of poets of high fame in classical Tamil literature.

According to the *Tiruviḷaiyāḍal Purāṇam, Kapilar* was born in Tiruvādavūr, and was a Brahman by birth. The

* *Puṛanānūṛu*, 200, 201 ; Pandit Swaminatha Iyer's Edition.

tradition that he was one of the seven children of the Brahman Bhagavan, through the non-caste woman Ādi, is not well supported by reliable literary evidence. But if this tradition be true—(there are some inconsistent elements in it),—he must have been the brother of Tiruvaḷḷuvar, the author of the *Kuṟaḷ*, and of the poetess Avvaiyār. This relationship, however, is nowhere in evidence in contemporary literature.

So far as they are available at present, *his works*,—all of them being "Paradises of Dainty Devices" in Tamil literature,— are :—

(1) The seventh of the *Padiṟṟuppattu*, the "Ten-Tens," in praise of the Cēramān Śelvakkaḍuṅgōvāḻiyādan.

(2) *Kuriñjippāṭṭu* of *Pattuppāṭṭu*, the "Ten-Idylls," to teach Prahasta, the Aryan king, Tamil.

(3) *Aiṅguṟunūṟu, Kuriñji Section*, the whole anthology having been collected and brought out by Kūḍalūr Kiḻār for the Cēra "Prince of the Elephant-eye" (*Yānaikkaṭchēy*).

(4) *Innā*, "that which is evil and as such to be avoided," 40.

(5) 20 stanzas in *Naṟṟiṇai*, 29 in *Kurumtogai*, 16 in *Ahanānūṟu*, and 31 in *Puṟanānūṟu*.

Kapilar appears, from his works, and from the high esteem in which he was held by his contemporaries, poets and potentates, and from the great approval with which he is quoted by grammarians and commentators alike, to have

been a specialist in composing poems relating to *Kuriñji*, *i.e.*, the hill-country, this being the scene of the inward feelings evoked, such as love, and the outward action induced by inward feelings.

As to *details of the author's life*, we have but little information. Of course, he sang in praise of the Cēramān Śēlvakkaḍuṅgō, and received a large reward, Otherwise, he appears to have been the life-long guest and intimate friend of his patron, Pāri of Paṛambunāḍu. It was after the death of this chief that the poet went about with his daughters to obtain for them eligible husbands, and that the allusive reference to the *Agnikula* descent was made for Iruṅgōvēḷ.

This *Pāri of Paṛambunāḍu* was one of the Seven Patrons, besides the Three Kings, who flourished about the same generation in South India.* All these are celebrated in the poem called *Śirupāṇāṛṛuppaḍai* of Nallūr Nattattanār, who sang in praise of Ērumānāṭṭu Nalliyakkōḍan, as a more liberal patron than the "Three Kings" and the "Seven Patrons." Those poems are rhapsodies of a Homeric character, sung on occasions by wandering minstrels, who received sumptuous rewards for their labour. The plan of the *Śirupāṇ* is that a wandering minstrel is at a loss to know where he could find a patron; and one such, returning from the court of the patron, solves the puzzle by pointing to the particular personage who is the object of praise. As a rule, therefore, these poems are directly addressed to the patron by the poet. And this

---

* *Pattuppāṭṭu*, Pandit Swaminatha Iyer's Edition: 3rd poem.

circumstance makes them of great importance for purposes of the history and social condition of those times.

Unfortunately, however, the author does not mention the Three Kings by any specific names,—a matter of indifference to them, as they could not have had any idea of the rise of laborious students of history among their posterity. But *the Seven Patrons* are referred to specifically enough. And certain of the details relating to the Kings themselves give important clues. The Seven Patrons are, in the order given by the poet :—Pēhan, round about the Paḷnīs; Pāri, along the Western Ghāts further north; Kāri, round about Tirukkōvilūr in South Arcot; Āay, round about Podiyil Hill in the west of Tinnevelly; Adiyamān, of Tagaḍūr, either the place of that name in the Mysore country or Dharmapuri preferably; * Naḷḷi, of Malaināḍu (there is nothing else by which to fix his exact locality); and Ōri, with his territory round about Kolli Malai in Salem. The Chōḷa is associated with Uṟaiyūr, and the Cēra with Vanji,—specifically, and not in the general terms in which the Mahārājas of Travancore are nowadays styled.

Kapilar is generally associated with *Paraṇar*; and the two together are usually spoken of by the older commentators Kapila-Paraṇar. That this is due to contemporaneousness, is proved by the fact that Kapilar was an elder contemporary of "the Cēra of the Elephant-look" in whose reign the *Aiṅguṟunūṟu* collection, of which Kapilar composed the third part, was made by Kūḍalūr

* See *Ind. Antiq.* Vol. XXII, pp. 66 and 143, and *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. VI, p. 331.

Kiḻār, a Śaṅgam celebrity. Further, both these poets, Kapilar and Paraṇar, interceded with Pēhan on behalf of his wife when he deserted her in favour of another woman. Thus, then, Kapilar and Paraṇar were contemporaries, and the latter celebrated Śeṅguṭṭuvan Śēra in the third section of the "Ten-Tens." This, therefore, takes the *Agnikula* tradition to the age of *Śeṅguṭṭuvan*, who was the grandson of Karikāla Chōḻa. This Karikāla is placed in the Leyden Grant and in the *Kaliṅgattupparaṇi* far anterior to Parāntaka I; and the *Śilappadhikāram* itself makes Śeṅguṭṭuvan the contemporary of a Gajabāhu of Ceylon, whose date is held to be A.D. 113 to 125.

The name of Pāri had become proverbial for liberality in the days of Sundaramūrti Nāyanār. This latter must have lived centuries before Rājarāja the Great, as some of his grants make donations to the image of the Nāyanār. It was Rājarāja's contemporary, Nambi Āṇḍār Nambi, who elaborated the *Tiruthoṇḍathogai* of Sundara. On these and other considerations, Sundaramūrti has been allotted to to the eighth century of the Christian era, and therefore Kapilar and others have to be looked for at a respectable distance anterior to this. For, between the date of Sundara and the fifth century A.D., the Pallavas of Kānchi occupied the premier position in South India, and there is absolutely no reference to this in the body of the literature to which the works under consideration belong.

The Cēra capital, as given in all these works, is Vanji, on the west coast, at the mouth of the Periyār; while the Chōḷa capital was Uṛaiyūr. In the later period, from the days of Kulaśēkhara Āḻvār, the Cēra capital certainly was

Quilon. This change is said to have taken place, according to tradition, after the days of Cēramān Perumāḷ, who was a contemporary of Sundara. Besides this, the language of the whole of the south was Tamil; Malayāḷam had not yet become differentiated from it. These considerations, again, would lead us to refer *Kapilar* and the galaxy to a period *anterior to the seventh century*, according to even the most unfavourable estimate.

But, in point of fact, the time referred to is much earlier than this. The contemporaneousness of Gajabāhu refers the period of Kapilar to *the second century A.D.*; and this, so far, has not been shown to be incorrect. There was at any rate a king Gajabāhu previous to the days of Mahānāman, the author of the earlier part of the *Mahāvamśa*.

Thus, then, *the tradition of a race of rulers whose eponymous ancestor was born from the sacrificial fire of a Rishi* is far older than the period for which Dr. Hoernle has found authority. This does not necessitate the affiliation of the one dynasty to the other. It only shows that the legend is very much older, and might have been laid hold of by ruling families at great distances, and otherwise unconnected, for the embellishment of genealogies, just as in the case of the Greeks of yore.

[*Reprinted from the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXXIV, 1905*].

A Glimpse into the early History of Konkan.

Konkan, or as it is sometimes written in Sanskrit Kōn-kaṇam, but ordinarily known as Konkaṇa, is the narrow tract of country lying between the Western Ghats, and the sea, on the western seaboard of peninsular India. It is generally spoken of as falling into seven divisions (*Sapta Konkaṇam*), and the names of the seven divisions are given with some slight variation, but on the whole generally uniformly in mediæval times. During the period, however, to which the so-called Śaṅgam literature of Tamil refers as a body, the term 'Konkan' seems to have indicated a far less extensive region of country along the same seaboard. It seems to have been bounded on the south by the territory under the authority of the Cēra rulers for the time being; on the west it was bounded by the sea; on the north it seems to have extended pretty far, but no defiinte limit is traceable, and on the east by the Ghats. One other noticeable feature of the geography of the Dakhan during this period is that the rest of the Dakhan was practically covered by the great forest *Daṇḍaka*, referred to in this class of Tamil literature as *Daṇḍāraṇyam*.* The high-

---

* குடக்கோ நெடுஞ் சேரலாதற்கு வேள
ளாவிக் கோமான்றேவி யீன்றமகன்
றண்டாரணியத்துக் கோட்பட் டவருடையைத்
தொண்டியுட்டந்து கொடுப்பித்துப் பார்ப்பார்க்குத்.

Padiṟṟuppattu, vi, *padigam*, 1, 3.

ways of approach from the north to the south were either along the west coast or along the east, the great forest region being between. At one time the political outlook of the Southern rulers seems to have been bounded by the Vindhya Mountains in the north, and the sea all round, although at this period this is varied sometimes by extending that outlook to the Himalayan frontier.

With this geographical introduction, we shall now proceed to consider what exactly can be gleaned from this body of literature in regard to the name 'Konkan' and its early history. Several derivations have been offered for the word generally of a fanciful character, and the latest in the field* is the most fanciful of them all. The actual explanation of the term is available to us in this body of Tamil literature. This literature divides the whole of the southern region, that is, the region south of the *Daṇḍaka*, into three kingdoms ruled over by crowned kings, and a number of chieftaincies; while the former number remains constantly three, the latter number varies from time to time from the highest, as far as we know from this class of literature, the number fourteen to as low a number as five. These numbers are by no means exhaustive, and some refer only to the more prominent ones at the time, the time to which the reference is actually made. Rulers in the Tamil land are divided into two classes, kings and chieftains, *Vēndar* and *Vēḷir*, respectively. The former are the three, and are crowned rulers; the latter are rulers of inferior dignity and not regarded as crowned kings in the orthodox sense of the term; but crowns are sometimes ascribed

* *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. iii, p. 138.

to them, so that the sovereign, suzerain for the time being, is sometimes spoken of as wearing a garland of seven crowns.* It is from the three crowns of these three monarchs that the Pallavas of a latter time took their title *Trai-rājya-Pallava* (Pallava ruling over the Chōḷa, Pāṇḍya and the Cēra), and the title, Mummuḍi Chōḷa, about both of which there was some misunderstanding and confusion even in a scholar of the eminence of the late Dr. Fleet.†

The kings ruled over compact territory in the best and the most settled portions of the land, and conducted their administration in the ordinary fashion of civilized king, doms. The rest of the land was region not so fertile, nor to settled either, and was therefore described as somewhat inferior in character. It was something of the nature of the non-regulation provinces of British History where it was more the rule of the sword than of the law. This region of the Tamils is described as *Kuṛunilam* meaning small or inferior land, and the chieftains entrusted with these non-regulation districts, to rule by force of military power, were known generally as *Kuṛunila Mannar* or *Vēḷir*, whose designation later on assumed the form of *Kuṛumbar*. This came to be used exactly in the sense of *Āraṭṭa* in Sanskrit, and the term *Āraṭṭa*‡ is used among

---

* எழுமுடி கெழீஇயதிரு ஞெமரகலத்துப்
பொன்னங்கண்ணிப் பொலந்தேர் நன்னன்
சுடர்வீவாகைக் கடிமுத றடிந்து.

Padiṛṛuppattu, poem 40.

† *Bombay Gazetteer* I, Pt. ii, p. 362n, 6.

‡ ஆறிருமதியினெய்தி யரட்டனையடர்த்து மற்றன்
வீறுயர் முடியுஞ்சூடி.

the Tamils as the exact synonym *Kuṟumbu*,* a somewhat depraved application of the term '*Svaraj*'. So '*Āraṭṭar*' or '*Kuṟumbar*' or '*Vēl-pula-araśar*' all mean the same, namely petty chieftains who held a sort of military rule over unsettled and comparatively barren districts allotted to their control, with a clear tendency always to throw off the authority of the suzerain power. They would thus correspond to the *Pāḷayagars* of modern British History.

One of these petty chieftains is known to Tamil literature as Nannan, who is described there as ruler of *Pāḻi-Nāḍu*,† otherwise described as ruler of '*Koṅkānam*, which produces gold'. The formation of the word '*Koṅkānam*'‡ shows its Tamil character. It breaks into two, '*Koḷ*' and '*Kānam*'. '*Koḷ*' means literally, taking forcible possession of that which is not one's own, that is plunder. That this is the way in which the word legitimately breaks up is indicated by the interposition of the (*adjective*) *perum*§ between the two words in some of these *Śaṅgam* poems, the word interpolated meaning merely 'great'. The whole expression would be the great forest region where it is legitimately open to anybody to take what he can, a sort of no man's land, legitimately open to occupation or appropriation by anybody that can do so. This seems to have comprised the territory of Tuḷu, that is the country, round Mangalore, and the two Kanaras, North and South. But how far further it extended northwards, we connot say with certainty.

* Arattan means Kuṟumban *Chintāmaṇi* 1221. (*Nachchinārkiniyar*

† See Note on p. 2.

‡ *Naṟṟiṇai*, 391, l. 7.
பொன்படு கொண்கான நன்ன னன்னாட்டு.

§ *Puṟam*, 154 and 155.

Chieftains of such territory were many, among whom was a powerful ruler of Konkan. He exercised his autocratic authority with perhaps undue rigour. He is said to have maintained a pleasure garden of his own planted with fruit trees, through which passed a river or a canal, past the garden. A girl who went to the river for a bath picked up a fruit floating down the stream and ate it off then and there. For this offence of the innocent maiden she was ordered to be killed. The parents offered to ransom her by giving him eighty-one elephants, a life-size golden statue of the girl and whatever else the chieftain in his mercy might demand. Nannan was inexorable and carried out his doom without relenting, and so he is handed down to posterity as Nannan 'the woman killer' for this act.* That the country was fertile in the production of gold is clear not only from this but the general attribute given to the country itself. namely, that 'its hills bore gold.† There is further evidence in the name given to the *Kāvēri* itself in Tamil. The river is called Ponni which means that which carried down gold, and the name is said to have been given to her as she brought down golden sands.‡ This gives the lie direct to the statement that gold was unknown in this part of India. Nannan's territory contained the port towns,

---

* மண்ணிய சென்ற வொண்ணுதலரிவை
புனறரு பசுங்காய்தின் றதன்றப்பற
வொன்பதிற் றொன்பது களிற்றொடவணிறை
பொன்செய்பாவை கொடுப்பவுங் கொள்ளான்
பெண்கொலை புரிந்த நன்னன்போல.

† *Paraṇar* in *Kurumtogai*, 292, ll. 1-6, p. 3, note 3, *supra*,

‡ *Paṭṭinappalāi*, l. 7.

of *Kaḍambin-peruvāyil,** *Pāram,*† *Pirambu*‡ and *Viyalūr*§ The famous hills of his land were Ēḻil Malai¶ (*Sapta-Saila* and Pāḻi ‖). The former is identifiable now, and is eighteen miles north of Cannanore. Near the other hill Pāḻi, the *Vaḍuhar*, that is, northerners other than Telugu and Kanarese speaking people, 'who made recent entry into the land' were turned back after a sanguinary fight by the Chōḻa ruler whose name is given as Iḻam Śēṭchenni. Hence he is known to Tamil literature as 'Śēṭchenni, the victor in the war of Pāḻi** Notwithstanding all this Nannan was a chieftain of literary taste and regard for literature. He had accumulated considerable wealth which he had secured in the citadel of Pāḻi, and gave freely of that wealth to learned men.†† At the same time he was rigorously valiant in war. On one occasion when a number of chieftains went to war against him, he defeated them in war and shaving off all the hair on the

---

* *Padiṟṟuppattu*, iv. *padigam*, l. 7.

† *Aham*, 152, l. 12.

‡ *Aham*, 356, l. 19.

§ *Aham*, 97, l. 13,

¶ *Aham*, 152, l. 13; *Naṟṟiṇai*, 391, l. 8.

‖ *Aham*, 258, l. 1; 152, l. 13.

** *Idaiyan Śēndan Koṟṟan* in *Aham*, 175, ll. 10–16.

சோழர் பெருமகன்
விளங்குபுகழ் நிறுத்தவிளம் பெருஞ்சென்னி
குடிக்கடனாக விற்குறை வினைமுடிமார்
செம்புறழ் புரிசைப் பாழி நூறி
வம்ப வடுகர் பைந்தலை சவட்டிக்
கொன்ற யானைக் கோட்டிற் றோன்றும்
அஞ்சு வருமரபின் வெஞ்சுரம்.

†† *Aham*, 258, ll. 1–3; 152, ll. 11-12.

heads of their women-folk, made ropes of them with which to tie the elephants he took from them.

He was at war with his Cēra neighbour described in Tamil literature as *Kaḷam Kāy Kaṇṇi Nārmudi Cēral.* The Cēra who had a garland of *'kaḷam kāy'* and twisted in his hair a fibre garland of some kind. He sent his general Āay Eyinan who was put to death by Nannan's general Mygñili.* This Eyinan was so powerful that another chieftain of rank in Madura was actually in hiding for fear of him, and felt relieved when he heard of his death. The Cēra king felt the loss so greatly that he turned all his forces against Nannan and killed him in battle at a place called *Vāhaipparandalai* which contained a *Vāhai* guard-tree and which Nannan himself worshipped.† This chieftain is celebrated in poems by a number of poets of Śaṅgam fame, chief among them being Paraṇar, Pālai-pāḍiya-Perum-Kaḍuṁkō, and Kallāḍan, who are known as Śaṅgam celebrities. Several others could be grouped round them from references that they have made to contemporary rulers.

From this account of the chieftain it becomes clear that the name 'Konkan' is of Tamil origin and was actually ruled over by a family of petty chieftains related to the Cēras in the centuries of the Christian era covered by the literature of the third Śaṅgam.

[*Reprinted from the Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.*]

---

* *Aham*, 142, ll. 7-14; 216, ll. 1-6.

† *Padiṟṟuppattu*, poem 4, *padigam*.

INDEX

PART I

(Diacritical marks are used to indicate correct pronunciation of the words.)

A

Abdul Karim, 532.
Abdullah Khan, 229.
Abdul Karim Buhlol Khan, 445.
Abdul Khan, 357.
Abdul Khumu Khan, 342.
Abdullah Khan, 375, 454, *passim*.
Abdullah Quṭub Shah, 391.
Abdul Rahim Khan, 342.
Abdur Razak, 36, 42, 340.
Abhimanyu, 62.
Abhirāmi, 347.
Abul Hassan, 427, *passim*.
Abusah, 21.
Abyssinians, 80, 183.
Acheen, 570.
Achyuta, 260, 261, *passim*.
Achyutarāya, 170, 192.
Adam's Bridge, 29.
Adam's Peak, 22.
Aḍappanāyaningāru, 159.
Adapanayque, 159.
Addanki, 144.
Adeem, 77.
Adham Khan, 360.
Adil Shah, 12, 83, 84, 86, 88, 91, 127, 128, 149, 153-157, *passim*.
Ādi Sultan, 7.
Ādi Sultan Malik Nēmi, 13.
Adoni, 126, 129, 136, 178, *passim*.
Africa, South, 537.
Āga Jalāl, 561.
Ahmadābād, 137.
Ahmad Bahmani, 154.
Ahmadnagar, 46, 82, 126, 128, 137, 152, *passim*.
Ahmad Nizam Shah, 153.
Ahmed Shah Wali Bahmani, 55, 71.
Ahmad Bahri Nizam-ul-Mulk, 81.
Ahōbalam (Ahōbala), 62, 95, 145, 148.
Akbar Jalāl-ud-din, 178–190, *passim*.
Āhsan Shāh, 8, 9.
Aiyappa, 560.
Ajaboissa, 169.
Akalkoṭ, 461.
Akbar, 212, *passim*.
Akkana, 280.
Aḻagar, 349.
Alamēlumangā, 218.
Alamghir, 517.
Alam Khan, 342.
Albuquerque, Alphanso, 124, 125, 128.
Allasāni Peddana, 172, 287.
Alaud-din, 363.

Ala-ud-dīn-Khan, 338.
Alau-d-dīn Sikandar Shah, 345.
Ala-ud-dīn Udauji or Uduji, 345.
Alexander, 57, 512.
Ali Adil Shah, 177, 186, 404.
Alkhajou, 532.
Allau-d-din, 42.
Allau-d-dīn I, 13.
Allau-d-dīn Bahmani, 26.
Allaud-dīn Bahmani II, 55, 65.
Alauddīn Khilji, 197.
Allau-d-dīn Sikandar Shah, 13.
Allau-d-dīn, Sultan, 38, 61.
Alau-d-dīn Udauji, 8.
Allumpanah, 572.
Alup Singh, 531.
Amarāvatī, 127, 144, 412.
Amarēśvara, 145.
Ambaji Pandit, 469.
Ambur, 36.
Ameen Khan, 243.
Amir Barīd, 153, 154, 158, 163, 166, 168.
Amir Khusru, 6.
Amirthagaṭēśvara, 425.
Amir-ud-dīn Ali, 502.
Amir-ul-Umāra, 515.
Ammachāvaḍi, 214, *passim*.
Āmuktamālyadā, 118, 120, 155, *passim*.
Āmūru [Giḍ Āmūru, Āmūrdurgah, 70.
Ānandabad, 412.
Ānanda Koil Kōvalan, 502.
Ānanda Ranga Pillai, 342.
Anandhāpuri, 235.
Anagondi, 198.
Anantāji, 232.
Anantapur, 36, 88, 94, 196, *passim*.
Āndhras, 69.
Ankuśagiri, 412.
Antiquities of the Madras Presidency, 13.
Anumakoṇḍa, 25.
Anwar-ud-dīn, 341.
Āpatsahāya, 151.
Appaji Rāyar, 352.
Aquiviva, Father, 315.
Āraga, 27, 252.
Arakalgūḍu, 235.
Arakan, 270.
Aram, Prince, 470.
Araśalūr, 425
Āravīḍu Dynasty, 315.
Archaeological Report, 16, 26.
Archaeologist's Annual, 44.
Archipelago, 538.
Arcot, 9.
Arcot, Nawab of, 241.
Arcot, North, 10, 30, 36, 72
Arcot, South, 73, 94.
Arikere, 221.
Ariyalūr, 413, 454, *passim*.
Arjuna, 62.
Arni, Jaghir of, 31, 527.
Āriya Chakravarti, 22.
Āriyan Periyanāyanār, 29.
Armogon, 311.
Asaud (Asad) Khan, 163, 166, 169, 411.
Asaf Khan, 410.
Asafud Dowlah Asad Khan, 515.
Asapur, 512.
Asiatic Researches, 49.

Asoka, (Mauryan Emperor), 3.
Aurangzeb, 234, 241, *passim*.
Ayodhya, 155.
Ayyalaiya, 137.
Ayyappa Nāyaka, 232.
Ayyapparasa, 169
Azam, 465
Azam Ushan, 532.
Aziz Himar, 25.

B

Baba Fakruddīn, 195.
Bābayya Daraga, 204.
Babayyanbeṭṭa, 204.
Bacare, 537.
Baḍandakoṭa, 71.
Baghdad, 118.
Bāgūru, 70.
Bahadur Geelany, 82, 83.
Bahadur Khan, 446.
Bahau-d-dīn, 8.
Bahīm-ul-mulk, 178.
Bahlol Khan, 399.
Bahmani, 27. 33, 38, 39, 42, 44, 46, 47, 49, 56, 59, 61, 66. 68, 70, 71, 72, 80, 81, 145, 152, 154, *passim*.
Bahmani Sultan, 13, 137.
Bairam Khan, 360.
Bāji Ghorpare, 416.
Baji Rao, 243.
Bakan, 32, 33.
Bālachandra Mahāpātra, 144.
Balaghat, 243.
Bālakrishna, 143.
Ball, 544.
Baḷḷāḷa, 10, 11, 12, 20, 31.
Baḷḷāḷa IV., 20, 24, 31.
Baḷḷappa Daṇṇāyaka, 20.
Baḷḷāpūr, 216.
Baḷḷāpūrs, 241.
Bāṇa, 412.
Bangalore (Beggalūr, Benguḷūru), 70, 192.
Banganapally, 557.
Bangāru-Tirumala Nāyakkar, 351
Bankāpūr, 129, 151.
Bantam, 570.
Bāṇas, 98.
Bānu, 41.
Barākadulla, 355.
Barakūr, 'Barakūru', 88, 92, 94.
Bārāmahals, 202.
Barani, 6, 8.
Barīd, 157.
Barīd Shah, 159.
Barīd Shahi, dynasty of, 81.
Baroda, 40.
Basava, 236.
Basavāpaṭna, 217, 228, *passim*.
Basavarasa Oḍeya, 94.
Batavia, 327.
Bāyapūr, 182.
Beaucephalus, 512.
Beḍandakoṭa, 70.
Bednore, 233.
Beejanagar, 82, 83, 165.
Beḷgaum, 48, 57, 59, 72, 163, *passim*.
Bellamkoṇḍa, 127, 137, 144, 544.
Bēlūr, 217.
Benares, 64, 180.
Bengal, 12, 22, 23, 41, 46, 570.
Bengāpūr, 160.
Berar, 153, 201, 537.
Beribi, 17.

Bēṭad Chāmarāja, 210, *passim*.
Bezwada, 472, 542.
Bhadrāchalam, 429.
Bhagavāndās, 361.
Bhāskarayya, 137.
Bhaṭkal, 48.
Bheema, Bhima (river), 82, 155.
Bhima Rāyar, 318.
Bhīmasen, 505.
Bhīm Singh, 496.
Bhogapur, 182.
Bhoja, 119, 120.
Bhujabala Mahārāya, 96.
Bhūmikōṭṭa, 532.
Bidar (Bider), 25, 71, 81, 82, 137, 152, *passim*.
Bihar, 544.
Bijanagar (Beejanaggar) 47, 127, 164.
Bijapur, 26, 82, 83, 88, 96, 123, 126, 128, 136, 143, 152-154, *passim*.
Bijjāvara, 235.
"Bilāl Deo," 10.
Biḷikere, 214, *passim*.
Biḷuguḷa, 214, *passim*.
Bindupūr, 418.
Bir, 6.
Bīrdhūḷ, 6.
Bīr Pāṇḍya, 6.
Bisalappa Nāyaka, 176.
Bisnaga(r), 67, 77, 78, 85, 94, 121, 140, 152, *passim*.
Boḷe Chāmarāja, 213, *passim*.
Bombaḷḷi, 230.
Bombay University Journal, 26.
Bowringpet, 53, 54.
Brigg, 8, 47, 145, 155, 164, *passim*.
Būdfaṭṭan, 21.
Bukka, 2, 13, 16, 26, 27, 30, 33, 197, *passim*.
Bukkāpaṭna, 192.
Bukkappa Rāzu, 26.
Bundelkhand, 511.
Burhan (Burhan) Nizam Shah, 163, 166.
Burhan-i-Māasir, 48, 55, 66, 81, 184, *passim*.
Burhan Nizam-ul-Mulk, 157.
Burhanpūr, 362, 467.
Busbalrao, 94, 95, 96, 121.
Butche Paupama, 561.
Butterworth, A., 170.
Buvanagiripaṭṭaṇam, 454.

C

Calicut, 21, 22, 23, 24, 128, 129.
Cannanore, 21.
Canara, North, 89.
Canara, South, 88, 94.
Canniambāḍi, 240.
Cape Comorin, 206, *passim*.
Carnatic Payin Ghat, 198.
Catuir, 130-134, 141, 147.
Ceylon, 22, 64.
Chakravarti, Mon. Mohan, 41.
Chāḷukyas, 61, 196, *passim*.
Chāmarāja, 211, *passim*.
Chāmarājēndra Woḍeyar, 205, *passim*.
Champurāya, 30, 132.
Chāmuṇḍi, 209, *passim*.
Chāṇakya, 536.
Chanda Saheb, 283.
Chande Khan, 353.
Chandekhan-Baḍekhan, 351.

Chandragiri, 62, 63, 64, 65, 68, 72, 75, 79, 123, 201, *passim*.
Chandragirirājya, 64.
Chandragupta, 539.
Channagiri, 424.
Channakēśavanātha, God, 69.
Channama, 228.
Channapaṭna, 72, 202, *passim*.
Channappa, 561.
Charamaodal, 130.
Charles, V., 118.
Chaull, 48, 50.
Chellapa Nāyakkar, 348.
Chengama, 516.
Chengamaladas, 441
Chennarayadurga, 235.
Chēra, 92.
Chidambaram, 95, 118, *passim*.
Chikka Dēvarāja, 231, 234, *passim*.
Chikka Dēvarāya Durga, 235.
Chikkamagaḷūr, 16.
Chikkanāyakanhaḷḷi, 217, 234, 458.
Chikka Oḍeya, 160.
China, 12, 20, 21, 22.
Chinna Bomma, 317.
Chinna Chevva, 285.
Chinnapp a Nāyaka, 348.
Chintanakal, 217.
Chingleput, 30.
Chinnādēvi, 139, 145 170.
Chirichirapali, 17.
Chitaldroog, 135, 230, 235, *passim*.
Chitoor, 466.
Chittūr, (Chittoor), 70, 132.
Chokkalinga, 442.
Chokkalinga Nāyaka, 232.
Chokkanatha, 269, *passim*.
Chola(s), 6, 30, 31, 61, 63, 92, 94, 130, 132, 196, *passim*.
Cholamanḍala, 130, 131.
Cholmley, Mr. Nathaniel, 542.
Christao de Figueyredo, 162.
Cobban, 18, 19, 23.
Cochin, 315.
Cogan, 317.
Coleroon, 24, 291.
Connomor, 311.
Conti, Nicolo, 540.
Comara, 159.
Comaraberca, 159.
Conadolgi, 78.
Condamara, 159.
Conjivaram, 132, 134, 135.
Coorg, 16, 17, 230, *passim*.
Coromandel, 10, 33, 43, 197, *passim*.
Couto, 181.
Crisnarao, 94.
Crooke, Sir William, 545.
Cuddapah, 36, 88, 94, 119.

D

Dabull (Dabul), 48, 50, 156, 157.
Dadoji, 236.
Daggada, 177.
Dahfaṭṭan, 21.
Dainātti, 534.
Dakhan (Dekhan) (Dekkan), 3, 33, 48, 81, 152, 153, *passim*.
Dakhni Roy, 510.
Dakhanis, 80, 183.
Daḷavāys, 241.
Dalpat Rao Bunḍēla, 505.
Dāmarapāḍ, 544.
Dāmarla Ayya, 377.

Dāmarla Venkaṭa, 377.
Danakoṭi Nāyaka, 420.
Dandarājāpūr, 399.
Danishmund Khan, 355.
Daṇṇāyaka, 25, 43.
Daṇṇāyakanakoṭe, 221.
Dārāpuram, 233.
Daśārṇa, 64.
Dastur (Destur), 157, 163.
Dastur Dinar, 153, 158.
Dastur-ul-Mulk, 158, 163.
Daud Khan, 509.
Daulatābād, 26, 32, 33, 177, 178, *passim*.
Dāvaṇigere, 135.
Day, 371.
Defremery, 11.
Delhi, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 32, 242, *passim*.
Demellyno, 157.
Desturvirido, 157.
Deogir (Devagiri), 4, 25, 197, *passim*.
Dēśing-Rāja, 352, 502, *passim*.
Dēśūr, 517.
Dēvanāmpaṭṭaṇam, 355.
Dēvarakoṇḍa, 56.
Dēvarāja, 216, *passim*.
Dēvarasa Voḍeya, 89.
Dēvarāya I, 19.
Dēva Rāya, II, 25, 36, 37, 38, 42, 44, 45, 52, 55, 64, 65, 68, 93, 148, *passim*.
Dēva Rāya III, 35.
Dēvulupaḷḷe (Devulappalle), 76, 90.
Dharaṇikoṭa, 145.
Dharēśvara, 89, 92.
Dharmapuri, 274.
Dharmarāya, 75.
Dijk, 311.
Dilawar Khan Habshi, 81.
Diler Khan, 435.
Dil Kasha, 496.
Dīn Ilāhi, 361.
Doab, 149, 157.
Doddabaḷḷāpūr, 87.
Dorien, Master, 358.
Dowlat Khan, 512.
Duff, 183.
Doḍḍa Krishnarāja, 242.
Domar, 160.
Durgada, 177.
Dureabar, 82.
Dustur Dinar, 154.
Dustoor Khan, 84.
Dustur-ul-Mulk, 154.
Dvārasamudra (Dhorasamudra), 10, 14, 15, 19, 26.

E.

Eggeling, 39, 40.
Einu-l-Mulk, 25.
Ekoji, 235, *passim*.
Elliott, 8, 25.
Ellore, 542.
England, 118, 490, 555.
Epigraphia Carnāṭaka, 12, 14, 15, 16, 36, 92, 135, 142, 146.
Epigraphia Indica, 61, 119, 127, 134.
Epigraphical (Epigraphists') Report, 26, 43, 65, 89.
Erode, 231, 232, *passim*.
Eṟṟamanchi, 192.
Erythraean Sea, 537.

F.

Fakanur, 21.
Fakhru-d-din Mubarak Shah, 345.
Fakru-d-din Mubarak Shah, 12.
Fandaraina, 21.
Faruksiyar, 511.
Fatan (*Paṭṭaṇam*), 12, 23, 24.
Ferishta, 8, 38, 41, 47, 48, 55, 71, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 126, 127, 143, 152, 155 *passim*.
Firozabad, 177, 183.
Firoz, Sultan, 32.
Floris, 315.
Fort St. David, 357.
Foster, Sir William, 321.
Frederic, Caesar, 186, 200, 257, *passim*.
Fryer, 477.

G.

Gajapati, 38, 39, 40, 49, 66, 96, 97, 118, 119, 120, 123, 127, 129, 130, 134, 136, 138, 139, 141–148, *passim*.
Gajapati Raya, 91.
Gambhīra Rāja Virupanna, 219–20.
Gaṁḍaja, 169.
Gandarajo (Gaundajo), 95.
Ganḍigōṭa, 70.
Ganḍikōṭa, 70.
Gangā Bhaṭṭ, 450.
Ganga, dynasty of, 41.
Gangādāsapratāpavilāsam, 38, 42.
Gangādēvi, 30, 31.
Gangarāja, 125, 126, 128, 131, 133, 134, 199, *passim*.
Gangā Sālār, 69.
Ganges, 180.
Ganji, 59.
Gauḍa, 43.
Gauta, 62.
Ghanagiri, 224.
Ghiyāthu-d-dīn Dhāmaghāni, 9, 10, 11, 12, 18, 23, 24, 32.
Ghulam Ali Khan, 519.
Ginjee, 206, *passim*.
Girappa, 178.
Gñānapurīśvara Temple, 7.
Goa, 20, 48, 50, 57, 72, 73, 82, 96, 129, 156.
Gobbūrī chief, 203.
Godavari, 25.
Goddamāri, 36.
Goḍuguchinta, 70.
Gōkarṇa, 95.
Golkonḍa, 82, 126, 128, 136, 153, 158, *passim*.
Gollapallee, 490, 542.
Gondwana, 42, 46.
Gooti, 243.
Gopa, 68.
Gopanna, 474.
Gōribiḍnūr, 90, 92.
Gourney, John, 316.
Govinda, 159.
Govinda Dīkshita, 286.
Govindarāja, 159, 169.
Grand Anicut, 369.
Guḍiyāttam, 70, 411.
Gujarāt, (Guzerat), 25, 40, 59, 61, 158.
Gujjali Kalyāṇa Rao, 139.
Gulbarga, 26, 153–155, 158, 164, *passim*.
Gulūr, 235.
Gunḍa, 61, 68, 69.

Gunḍa, III, 62.
Gunḍarāja, 53.
Gunḍlu, 236.
Gunḍlupet, 96.
Gunḍlūr, 231.
Guntakal, 190.
Guntur, 147.
Gussafur Khan, 516.
Guṭṭirājya, 95.
Gyfford, 476.

H

Habshi(s), 57, 80, 81, 183.
Hadana, 210, *passim*.
Haidarabad (Hyderabad), 144, 190.
Haidar Ali, 204, *passim*.
Haiva, 89.
Hakka, 2.
Haḷebiḍ, 4, 252, *passim*.
Halasangi, 462.
Hambir Rao, 469.
Hampi, 16, 118, 119, 142, 143, 198, *passim*.
Hamsakūṭapura, 418.
Handaḷagēri, 235.
Hanḍē Malakappa Nāyuḍu, 258.
Hanḍe Nāyaka, 201.
Hanumāji Pandit, 531.
Harapāla, 363.
"Harekaṭu", (Arcot), 9, 23.
Hariappa Uḍaiyār, 26, 27.
Harīb, 26.
Harihara, 26, 69, 95, 197, *passim*.
Harihara II, 28, 33, 69.
Haroun-al-Rashid, 118.
Hasan Abdul, 446.
Hassan, 220, 233, 440, *passim*.
Hatsell, Mr., 507.
Hatton, Mr., 549.
Hayapati, 39.
Hayat Khan, 532.
Hearsey, Mr., 571.
Heemaraj, 86.
Hēmāji Punḍit, 229.
Hēmanaḷḷi, 221, *passim*.
Hēmāvati, 196.
Hemingway, 19.
Henjēru, 196.
Heraṇyavāha (Hiraṇyavāha), 537.
Heras, Rev. H., 315.
Herodatus, 156.
Hili, 21.
Hinur, 21.
Henry VIII, 118.
Himalayas, 62, 64.
Hiri Beṭad Chāmarāja Woḍeyar, 210, *passim*.
Hiri Chāmarāja Woḍeyar, 210, *passim*.
Hiri Timmarāja, 206.
Honawar (Honovar), 12, 21, 22, 23, 25, 48, 197, *passim*.
Honnavaḷḷi, 235.
Horaib, 25.
Hosapaṭṭaṇa, 252.
Hosapaṭṭana, 15, 16.
Hoskoṭe, 15, 222, 376.
Hospet, 149, 163.
Hoyśalas, 2, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 70, 75, 132, 196, *passim*.
Hoyśana, 69.
Hullanahaḷḷi, 214, *passim*.
Hultzsch, Dr. E., 13, 35, 36, 119.

Humayun, 56.
Hura, 214, *passim*.
Hurdis, Thomas Bower, 359.
Hurmatti, 137.
Hussun, 8.
Hussain Nizam Shah, 182, 187.
Huttāri, 70.

I

Ibn Batuta, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 30.
Ibrahim, 8, 399.
Ibrahim Beg, 166.
Ibrahim Khan, 452.
Ibrahim Kuṭub Shah, 181, 187, 201, 258, *passim*.
Ikkēri, 126, 136, 230, *passim*.
Ikkēri Nāyaka, 228.
Imad Shah, 153, 158.
Imad-ul-mulk, 163.
Immaḍi Dēvēndra, 37.
Immaḍi Narasimha, 75, 76, 88, 89, 93, 97.
Immaḍi Narasinga Rāya, (Rāyaru), 79, 80, 90.
Imād-ul-Mulk, 153, 157, 179.
Imam-ul-mulk, 177, 183.
Immaḍi Krishnarāja Woḍeyar, 245.
Immaḍirāja, 221.
India, 3, 20, 22.
Indian Antiquary, 25, 56, 182.
India, Northern, 4.
India South (Southern), 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 24, 30, 33.
Indra, 38.
Ingolgi, 182.
Īraṇṇangēri, 204.
Ismail Adil, 126, 127, 154, 157, 164, *passim*.
Iswar Das, 495.
Īśvara-Nāyaka, 53, 60, 70, 75, 76, 93.
Īśvarappa (Yīśarappa) Nāyaka, 89, 92.
Iyakkarai Vaiyappa Nāyakkar, 348.

J

Jaffna, 290.
Jaffnapatam, 571.
Jagadēva Rāyal, 202, 217, *passim*.
Jagannātha, temple of, 41.
Jaggarāya, 203, 263, *passim*.
Jaggayyapeṭṭa, 544.
Jahāngir, 362.
Jahlna, 175, 178, 187, *passim*.
Jaitāji, 236.
Jalālu-d-dīn Āhsan Shah, 7, 8.
Jalāl-ud-dīn Akbar, 183.
Jalāluddīn Pādusha, 177.
Jamālgar (Jamālgarh), 177, 183.
Jamālu-d-dīn Muhammad, Sultan, 21, 25, 197, *passim*.
Jambai, 65, 94.
Jambukēśvaram, 64.
Jamini Bhāratmu, 62.
Jamkhanḍi, 26.
Janārdana Nārāyan Hanumantē, 442.
Janyālu, 144.
Jarfaṭṭan, 21.
Jatakanadurga, 235.
Jatak Rāy, 56.
Jayanti Ramayya Pantulu, Mr., 70, 76.
Java, 12, 22.
Jesvata, 236.
Jeypore, 517.

Jihangir Khan, 154.

Jitaph Khan, 138.

Jiziya, 20.

Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 41, 43.

Jumkindy, 83.

Jyēshṭa, 69.

K

Kabbāḷadroog, 244.

"Kabban" 10.

Kadalimalai, 531.

Kadapa, Nawab of, 243.

Kadar Sahib, 358.

Kādavar(s), 132, 133, 135.

Kadur, 12, 17, 24, 96, 235, *passim*.

Kākaḍ Khan, 516.

Kākatīya (Kākatīyas), 2, 209, *passim*.

Kāḷahasti, 63, 95, 144, 148, 232, *passim*.

Kaḷaiyārkōil, 340.

Kaḷalē, 217.

Kaḷalē Veerajiah, 241, 242, *passim*.

Kaḷasa Kārkaḷa, 96.

Kaḷavaraga (Kulberga), 41.

Kaḷavaragajayi, 41.

Kalinga, 64, 66, 70, 123, 129, 130, 135, 139, 141, 144, 155, *passim*.

Kallaha Rama Ranga Pillai, 502.

Kalyāṇi, 61.

Kamalādēvi, 61.

Kāma (Cāma) Nāyaka, 158, 160.

Kambammeṭṭu, 144.

Kampaṇa, 26, 28, 30, 31, 197, *passim*.

Kampaṇa Uḍaiyār, 27, 339, 346.

Kamparāya, 30.

Kamparāya Charitam, 30, 31, 132.

Kampḷi, 8, 198.

Kampraz, 26.

Kanaka-Sabhā (Chidambaram), 118.

Kanara, (Kanarah), 57, 58, 65.

Kānchi, (Conjeevaram) 43, 48, 49, 59, 65, 66, 80, 95, 125, *passim*.

Kandarpi, 415.

Kanḍe Rao, 515.

Kanducūru, (Kandukūru), 71, 137.

Kanhikere, 235.

Kanishṭa, 69.

Kankayya, 17.

Kannaḍa, 2.

Kaṇṇanūr-Koppam, 10, 18, 19, 30.

Kanniambāḍi, 215, *passim*.

Kānthia, 241.

Kanṭhīrava Narasa, 223, 230, *passim*.

Kanṭhīrava Narasarāja Woḍeyar, 219 *passim*.

Kānusahib (Khan-Sahib), 356.

Kanvi Pass, 411.

Kapilēśvara, 42, 43, 46, 47, 49, 56, 66, 71.

Kapilēśvara Bhowarbar, 41, 55.

Kapilēśvara Dēva, 55.

Kapilēśvara Gajapati, 65, 73.

Kapras (Kapraz) 26.

Karachūri Nanjarājaiya, 245.

Karikāla Mallarājayya, 220 *passim*.

Karnāṭa (Carnatic, Karnatic) 41, 43, 47, 71, 96.

Karnāṭās, 75.

Karṇāṭājahasasimha, 41.

Karnūl, 133.

Karoogahaḷḷi, 208, 215, *passim*.

Kārvēṭinagar, 70, 132.
Kasavapātra, 144.
Kāśi, 64.
Kasim Barid (Bareed) Turk, 81, 82, 83, 84, 86, 153.
Kastūrirangappa Nāyaka, 349.
Kaṭak, 41, 134, 146, 147.
Kaṭlagh Khan, 25,
Kaṭṭiyam Kāmaiya Nāyaka, 348.
Kaulas, 47.
Kauṭilya, 536.
Kāvēri (Kavery), 25, 64, 91, 125.
Kavēripaṭṭinam, 418.
Kāvēripāk, 570.
Keḷadi, 217, 235.
Kempa Dēvaiya, 230.
Kempē Gauḍa, 419.
Kengē Hanuma, 228.
Kēraḷa(s), 6, 61, 69.
Kesarēgonṭe, 217.
Kētasamudra, 235.
Kētavaram, 144.
Kēvaṭam Venkaṭapati, 532.
Khafi Khan, 495.
Khanda, 43.
Khāndēsh, 158, 537,
Khan-i-Jahan, 33, 467.
Khan-i-Khanan, 229.
Khaniyavāḍi Nāyaka, 178.
Khān-i-Zamān, 408.
Khankanhaḷḷi, 72.
Khan Muhammad, 408.
Khawās Khan, 435.
Khiljis, 2.
Kishwar Khan Lary, 181.
Khōjah Sarlak, 23.
Khusru Khan, 6, 15.
Khwājah Jahān, 57, 80.
Khwājah Mahammad Gawān, 57.
Kielhorn, Prof., 29, 44.
Kiratas, 235.
Kōdanḍarāma, 440.
Kodawand Khan, 153.
Kolar, 20, 72, 252, *passim*.
Kolar Gold Fields, 545.
Kolatala, 216.
Kollam, 344.
Kollūr, 490.
Kollūr (Gaṇi Kollūr), 544.
Konḍamarasa, 159.
Kondana, 415.
Konḍapalli, 47, 137, 140.
Konḍavīḍ(u), 56, 58, 66, 79, 95, 96, 123, 127, 135-37, 139, 141, 142, 144, 147, 148, 155, *passim*.
Konḍayya, 137.
Konḍiyāta, 319.
Konḍūr, 137.
Kōnēri Chetty, 394.
Kongu, 230.
Kongudēśarājākkaḷ, 125, 134.
Konkaṇ (Concan, Kōnkaṇa), 20, 26, 82, 89, 154.
Koppam, 18.
Kōpperunjinga, 132.
Kottagāla, 212, *passim*.
Kottapalli, 334.
Koṭṭiyam Nāgama Nāyakkar, 348.
Kōvela Nallūru, 70.
Krishna, Dt. of, 489.
Krishna (River) 3, 4, 66, 71, 83, 125, 129, 134, 137, 138, 146, 148, 164, *passim*.
Krishna Dēva Rāya, 74, 76, 98, 117, *passim*.

Krishṇaghaḍi, 532.
Krishṇagiri, 177.
Krishṇagūr, 412.
Krishnappa Nāyaka, 2, 25, 295, *passim*.
Krishṇāpuram, 142.
Krishṇarāja, 211, *passim*.
Krishṇa Rāya, 95, 96.
Krishṇarājavijayamu, 120, 124, 125, 131, 137, 146, 151, *passim*.
Krishṇa Śāstri Mr. H., 4, 44, 45, 49, 60, 69, 88, 92, 94, 118, 125, 134, 135, 147.
Kūḍal-Aḻagar, 151.
Kuḍipatik, 345.
Kuhu (Kuku) Sahib, 353.
Kuḷan, 21, 22.
Kulaśēkhara, 338.
Kulberga, (Kulburga), 41, 69, 71, 139.
Kumāra, 159.
Kumāradūrjati, 120.
Kumāra-Hammīra-Mahāpātra, 144.
Kumāra Kampa, 132.
Kumāra Kampana, 27, 28, 30, 31, 65, 132, 197, *passim*.
Kumārakrishṇappa Nāyaka, 349.
Kumaralingam, 439.
Kumāra Vīrayya, 159-61.
Kumbakonam, 64, 95, 204, *passim*.
Kumpta, 89.
Kundāṇi, 10, 19, 70.
Kurbat Hasan Kangu, 32, 33.
Kurnool, 243.
Kurukuru Timmappa Nāyakkar, 348.
Kūṭakas, 69.
Kuṭavāchala, 65.
Kuṭavāchalēndrataṭavāsi, 64.
Kuṭub Shah, 144, 145, 153, 154, 158, 171.
Kutub-ul-Mulk, 157.
Kyana Sahib, 359.

L

Lakkana, 65, 340.
Lālā Dakṇi Rāy, 516.
Lāla Toḍarmal, 516.
Langhorn, Sir William, 459.
Lanka, 62.
Lāt, 58.
Leonidas, 513.
Lingama Nāyaka, 317.
Lingappa, 453, 559.
Lisbon, 133.
Lohardaga District, 544.
London, 499, 555.
Love, Col., 460.
Luis, Friar 124, 125-28.

M

Māchayyā, 199
Māchayya Danḍanāyaka, 196.
Mackenzie, 13, 14, 337.
Macleod, Col. William, 502.
Madana, 280.
Madanmust, 517.
Madapollam, 476.
Maddagiri, 235.
Madhura, 91.
Madhurā Vijayam, 132.
Madras, 324.
Madras Journal of Literature and Science, 11.

Madre Maluco (Madre Malluco), 157, 163.
Madura, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 64, 88, 132, 197, *passim*.
Madura Country, Manual of, 13.
Maertssen, Arend, 309.
Mafūs Khan, 341.
Māgaḍi, 83, 216, *passim*.
Mahābalipuram, 149.
Mahānandi, 95.
Mahmad Shah Bahmani, 81, 82.
Mahmad Shah II, Sultan, 80, 164.
Mahiber Himbal Kutub Shah, 177.
Maharatta, 15, 59, 72.
Makdumah Jahan, 56, 59.
Malabar (Ma'bar), 6, 7, 8, 15, 21, 22, 23, 30, 32, 33, 197, *passim*.
Malacca, 570.
Malaga-Bennur, 141.
Mālangi, 218, *passim*.
Maḷavaḷḷi, 93.
Malavaram, 544.
Malaya Peninsula, 538.
Māldives, 12, 22, 23.
Male, 27.
Malega-Bennur, 135.
Malē Rājya, 72.
Malhari Rao, 357.
Malik Kafur, 5, 6, 18, 28.
Mālkhēḍ, 463.
Mallaiya, 387.
Mallāmbikā, 62.
Malliābād, 160.
Mallik Ahmad Bary (Bahri), 82.
Mallikārjuna, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 65, 70, 72, 74, 79.
Malnāḍ, 72, 438.
Malukkaṉ, 345.
Mālūr, 16, 48, 58, 66.
Malva (Malwa, Malava), 25, 42, 43, 46, 59.
Mānabhūpa, 92.
Manat, 58.
Mandeville, Sir John, 540.
Manḍya, 53.
Mangaḷagiri, 141.
Mangalore, 21.
Mangammāḷ, 281.
Manilla, 570.
Manjēra, (River), 462.
Mannārguḍi, 285.
Mantrakūṭa, 25.
Mantenna, 25.
Manucharitē, 146.
Marakatanagara, 132.
Māranāyaka, 208, *passim*.
Mārappa, 27.
Māravarman Vīra Pānḍya, 27.
Marcelis, Hans, 310.
Marco-Polo, 540.
Martin, 454.
Masaud, 464.
Master, Sir Streynsham, 458.
Masulipatam, 324, 459, *passim*.
Mecca, 429.
Mēlachēri, 515.
Mellavallee, 490.
Mellwillee, 553.
Mēlukōṭe, 209, *passim*.
Mēlupākkam, 427.
Meru, 62.
Mīḍagēśi, 235, 241, *passim*.

Mīnākṣi, 283.
Mīnākṣinātha Piḷḷai, 356.
Mīnākṣi-Sundarēśvara, 351.
Minnal, 317.
Mir Astekhan Bahadur, 359.
Mir-i-Jumla, (Mir Jumla), 81, 204, *passim*.
Mirza Jehāngeer, 166.
Mirza Mohammad, 471.
Mohabat Khan, 513.
Mohidin-Sahib, 357.
Moodkal, 82, 84.
Mopur, 95.
Mōrār Pant, 372.
Morasas, 235.
Moreas, Prof., 26.
Moreland, Mr. W. H., 308.
Mubarak Khilji, Sultan, 6, 14, 15, 197, *passim*.
Muchlypaṭam, 47.
Muddappa, 27.
Muḍkal, 124, 126, 127, 129, 136, 143, 152, *passim*.
Muḍegere, 86.
Mūgūr, 214, *passim*.
Muhammad, 14, 20, 25.
Muhammad Adil Shah, 404.
Muhammad Ali, 341, 532.
Muhammad-bin-Tughlaq, 15, 25, 26, 197, 362, *passim*.
Muhammad Gawan, 48, 59, 80, 152.
Muhammad Murād, 502-3.
Muhammad, Mustāfa, 345.
Muhammad Sayyed Khan, 516.
Muhammad Syed Kēvud, 515.
Muhammad Shah, II, 47, 66, 153–4.
Muhammad (Sultan), 20, 25, 33.
Muhammad Shah, Sultan, 32.
Muhammad Suratana, 7.
Muḷbāgal, 27, 53, 73, 132, 252, 253, *passim*.
Mulla Ahmed, 411, 417.
Mullu Khan, 144.
Muḷuvāyi Mahārājya, 65.
Munro, Sir Thomas, 275.
Muppim Dēvarāja, 212, *passim*.
Mūrtimāmba, 286.
Mūsa Khan, 430.
Mushṭika, 235.
Mustābād, 491, 553.
Mustafa Khan, 229, 375.
Muthiyāl Nāyakan, 524.
Mutrah (Madura), 10, 11.
Muttaḷagu Pillai, 357.
Muttukrishnappa Nāyakkar, 349.
Muttutirumala Nāyakkaraiyan, 349.
Muttuvīrappa, 259, 270, *passim*
Mylapore, 316.
Mysore, 2, 10, 16, 17, 27, 71, 72, 88, 96, 125, 134, 160 *passim*.
Mythic Society, 1, 34.

N

Nāchiapiḷḷai, 348.
Nāgalādēvi, 149.
Nāgalāpura, 163.
Nāgamanḍalam, 64, 65.
Nāgama Nāyaka, 76.
Nāgamangala, 72, 228, 232, *passim*.
Nāgārjunikonḍa, 137, 144.
Nāgarakhanḍa, 65.
Nagar Puṭṭaiya Panḍit, 421.
Nagiri Rājya, 89.
Nagumdyam, 85.
Naldrug, 158, 461.

Nallamalais, 544.
Nandar Khan, 452.
Nandi, 417.
Nandidrug, 424.
Nandyāl, 408.
Nanjanagūḍu, 211, *passim*.
Nanjarāja Woḍeyār, 230, 241, *passim*.
Nānjināḍu, 339.
Nāragallu, 70.
Nāragonḍa, 70.
Naraharipātra, 144.
Narapati, 129.
Narasa, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 86, 87, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 97, 120, 122, 123, 125, *passim*.
Narasa (Narasaṇa) Naik (Narasenaque), 48, 53, 70, 75, 76, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 96.
Narasarāja, 218.
Narasayya Nāyakar, 347.
Narasimha, 36, 37, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 86, 93, 96, 130.
Narasimhāchāryar, Rao Bahadur, R., 17, 52, 53, 74.
Narasimhadēva, 237.
Narasimha Nāyaka, 60.
Narasimha Rāya, 57, 88, 59, 60.
Narasinga, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 54, 55, 60, 86, 87, 254, *passim*.
Narasing Rai Langora, 41.
Narasyingua (Narasymgua), 77, 78.
Nārāyaṇa Pillai, 502.
Nārāyaṇa Rāyar, 359.
Nārāyaṇa Reḍḍi, 36.
Nārāyaṇa Śambuvarāyan, Rāja, 31.
Nārāyaṇavaram, 253.
Nārāyan Hanumante, 442.
Narbada, 3.
Naro Tirumal Hanumante, 442.
Narsymgua, 51, 67, 68.
Nasarat Khan, 28.
Naśiru-d-dīn II, 12, 23, 24, 28, 32.
Naśiru-d-dīn, Mahmud Ghazi Damaghan Shah, 345.
Nasratābād-Sāgar, 155.
Nāyakanēri Pass, 411.
Neacynda, 537.
Negapatam, 291.
Neknam Khan, 451.
Nelevīḍu, 15.
Nellore, 6, 70, 71, 147, 149.
Nelson, 13, 14.
Niḍugal, 196.
Nivṛitti, 95.
Nizam's Dominions, 2, 136, 147.
Nizam Shah, Sultan, 56, 154, 157, 158, *passim*.
Nizam-ul-Mulk, 163.
Nizam-ul-Mulk Bāhri, 57, 80.
Nṛsimha, God, 62.
Nullūr Vijayapura, 221.
Nuniz, 35, 36, 37, 48, 49, 52, 54, 55, 67, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 49, 85, 87, 88, 93, 94, 95, 120, 122, 123, 127-235, 139, 140, 141, 147, 150-155, 156, *passim*.
Nūrullah, 404.
Nuzvid, 551.

O

Odegary, 77.
Ogendrāhō, 159.
Ōmalūr, 233, 274.
Orissa, 40, 41, 42, 33, 46, 47, 49, 55, 56, 57, 59, 63, 66, 133, 134, 139, 140, 147.
Orme, 19.

Oromuz, 77, 162, 570.
Orta, Garcia-de, 540.
Ouamysyuaya, 94.
Oudh, 25.

P

Paḍaivīḍu, 31, 502.
Padanda Rao, 532.
Padea Rao, 37, 49, 51.
Pādsha Bībi, 464.
Paes, 122, 127, 135, 150-2, *passim*.
Pālār, 412.
Pallavas, 132.
Panaiyūr, 7, 354.
Panchavaṭī, 236.
Paṇḍhārpūr, 251.
Pāṇḍyan (Pāṇḍya, Pāṇḍyas), 4, 6, 24, 30, 31, 43, 61, 132.
Parākrama Pāṇḍya, 19, 344.
Paras Dāḷvi, 6
Pārijāthāpaharaṇam, 70, 71, 131.
Parnapalle (Paranapalle), 36.
Pārśvanātha, 193.
Pārvatī, 15.
Pasand Khan, 81.
Paśupatikōvil, 296.
Pāthēya, 69.
Paṭṭukoṭṭai-Vīrappa Nāyakkar, 348.
Pāvāchala, 40.
Payeen Ghat, 71, 243, *passim*.
Payya Ramakrishna, 518.
Peddanna, 146.
Pegu, 570.
Penagumḍim, 85.
Peṇṇār, 6, 201, *passim*.
Peṇṇāttūr, 532.
Penugoṇḍa (Penukoṇḍa), 25, 26, 43, 46, 53, 54, 65, 70, 88, 125-8, 133, 142, 180, 189, *passim*.
Periapatam, 230.
Periplus, 537.
Perkatapah, 57.
Perumāḷa Danḍanāyaka, 237.
Pettapolee, 324, *passim*.
Phillip III, 315.
Pimenta, Father, 315.
Pina Rao, 49, 52.
Pina Rāya, 36, 37.
Podili Linganna, 452.
Pollepalle Venganna, 452.
Pollicull, 549.
Pondicherry, 488.
Ponnalā Dēvi, 37.
Poona, 242, 509.
Poonamallee, 6, 378.
Porto Novo, 401.
Portuguese, 128, 129.
Prauḍa Dēva Rāya, 52.
Pratāpacharitam, 25.
Pratāpa Dēva, 44, 45.
Pratāpa Rudra, 97, 135, 139, 141, 142, 144.
Pratāparudra II, 25.
Prauḍha (Pratāpa) Dēva Rāya, 36, 37, 38, 49.
Prithugiri, 64.
Proddaṭṭūr, 94.
Proenza, Antoine de, 405.
Pudukoṭṭa, 7, 19, 29, 251, *passim*.
Pulicat, 309, 324.
Pulivenḍla, 119.
Punganūr, 216.
Purchas, 315.

Purēndah, 153.
Puru, 60.
Purushōttama, 47, 49.
Purushōttama Gajapati, 66.
Puttalam, 22.

Q

Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, 34.
Quilon, 21.
Quitinno, Father, 315.
Quṭb-ud-dīn, 9.
Quṭbu-d-dīn Firoz Shah, 345.
Quṭub Shah, 405.

R

Rāchirāja, 95.
Rāyavāchakamu, 137, 139.
Raichore (Rāchore, Rāchuru) 79, 82, 83, 84, 123, 124, 126, 127, 129, 136, 143, 144, 148, 149-51, 155-7, *passim*.
Rachol, 77.
Raghunātha, 203, 264, 286.
Raghunāth Narain Hanumantē, 280.
Raghunātha Nārāyan, 443.
Raghunāthapura, 297.
Raghunāth Pant, 450.
Raizpent, 554.
Rājagambhīram, 132.
Rājagambhīram, hill of, 31.
Rājagambhīra (Rājyam) 30, 31.
Rajaghaḍi, 532.
Rājamandri, 46, 47, 56, 57, 66, 133, 140, 141.
Rājānātha Dinḍima, 60.
Rajaputana, 20, 467.
Rājārām, 507.
Rājaśēkhara, 36, 49, 52.
Rāja Woḍeyar, 202, 203, 208, *passim*.
Rākshasa-Tangaḍi, 177, 179, 183, *passim*.
Rāma, 201, 203, 204, *passim*.
Rāmabhadra, 294.
Rāmabhadrāmbā, 287.
Rāmadas, 429.
Rāmānuja, 240.
Rāmarāja, 173-4, *passim*.
Rāmdēv, 363.
Rāmallakōṭṭa, 490, 543.
Rāmappa Gauḍa, 236.
Rāma Śāstri, 427.
Rāmaswāmi Ayyan, 358.
Rāmayadēva, 94.
Rāmayaśōḷa-Mahārāja, 94.
Rāmēśvaram, 6, 16, 64, 94, 95, 197, *passim*.
Rāmji Tirumal, 173, 182, *passim*.
Ramnad, 28, 251, *passim*.
Ram Shetty, 531.
Ramygupa, 94.
Raṇadhoola Khan, 227, 235, *passim*.
Raṇavara, 217.
Ranga, 321.
Rangāchāri, 314.
Rangakrishnamutuvīrappa Nāyakkar, 350.
Ranganātha, God, 62, 285.
Ranganāyaki, 218.
Rangasamudra, 221, 223, *passim*.
Rangaśāyi Nāyaka, 420.
Rāngiam, 7.
Rapson, Professor, 117.
Rāvalkonḍa, 490, 544.

Ravi Varman Kulaśēkhara, 6, 197.
Ravo Pandit, 358.
Rāyavāchakamu, 124, 126, 146, 155, *passim*.
Rāyasam Koṇḍamarasa, 149.
Razipent, 490.
Red Sea 158.
Rēmati Venkaṭa, 260.
Rēvati Venkaṭa, 260
Revington, 399.
Rice, Mr., 16, 17, 44, 205, *passim*.
Rodgers, 13.
Royal Asiatic Society, Journal of, 13, 75, 118.
Rudra I, Kākatīya, 25.
Rustam-i-Zaman, 399.
Rustam Rao, 431.

S

Saadatullah, Nawab of the Karnāṭic, 243, 510.
Sadāśiva, 257.
Sadāśiva Rāya, 186, 200, 204, *passim*.
Sādat Tiyār Khan, 531.
Sādhāraṇade (va) Voḍeya, 88.
Sāgara, 155.
Sagarē, 155.
Saipa, 69.
Saiyyad Mustapah, 428.
Sakalalōka Chakravartin, 31.
Sakkarēpaṭna, 233.
Sakkrēpaṭna, 440.
Śākkoṭṭai, 297.
Salābat Khan, 162.
Salem, 10, 70.
Sāḷuvābhyudayam, 60, 63, 68, 69.
Sāḷuva Dēva Rāya Voḍeya, 89.
Sāḷuva Gōvinda, 142, 169, 170, 256. *passim*.
Sāḷuva Gōvindarāja, 94, 95.
Sāḷuva Mangi, 60, 61, 68, 69.
Sāḷuva Narasimha, 46, 52, 54, 55, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 88, 89, 93, 123, 124, 129, 136, 148, *passim*.
Sāḷuva Narasimha II, 75, 87, 88.
Sāḷuva Narasinga I, 53, 76, 79, 97, 133, 199, *passim*.
Sāḷuva Narasinga II, 53.
Sāḷuvas, 60, 68, 69, 74, 75, 99.
Sāḷuva Timmayya (Timma), 95, 121–123, 129, 130, 134, 136–138, 140, 142, 145, 155, *passim*.
Sāḷuva Timmayyangāru, 95.
Sāḷuva Tippa, 68, 69.
Sāḷuva Tirumalidēva-Mahārāja, 53.
Sāḷuvēndra, 62.
Sambāji (Śambhūji), 467.
Sāmbaḷḷi, 230.
Sambhal, 20.
Śambhu, 236.
Śambuvarāyans, 30, 31, 61, 69.
Samparāya, 132, 133.
Sampat Iyengar, Mr., 539.
Sangama, 60.
Sanguinetti, B. R., 11.
Sanjar Khan, 56.
Śankarāchārya, 427.
Sankula Naika, 126, 136.
San Thome, 452.
Sarfōji, 419.
Sarg-Dwāri, 25.
Sarkar, Sir Jadunath, 404.

Sarūp Singh, 510.
Sattanapaḷḷee, 544.
Satyamangala, 230, 439.
Satyanātha Aiyar, R., 380.
Sāvandi, 243.
Sāvaṇdroog, 244.
Sayid Āli, 182, 184, 185, *passim*.
Sayyad Ahmad, 429.
Sayyad Brothers, 510.
Sayyad Muzāffar, 430.
Sayyad Rāju Kathal, 430.
Scott, 86, 126.
Sēnaghaḍi, 515.
Seringapatam, 126, 131, 135, 159-61, *passim*.
Sētupati, 351.
Sewell, Mr., 13, 14, 35, 38, 48, 74, 75, 76, 89, 93, 94, 123, 124, 126, 130, 134, 140, 145, 150–2, 157, *passim*.
Shah Ālam, 467.
Shah Jahan, 268, 278, *passim*.
Shāhji, 266, 268, *passim*.
Shāhjikōṭe, 298.
Shaik Abdul Khadar, 532.
Shaik Nūr, 518.
Shamsi Siraj Afif 25, 32.
Sharīf Jalal-ud-din Ahsan Shah, 345.
Sher Khan, 194, 454.
Shikār Udaya Ram, 518.
Shimoga, 27.
Sholāpūr, 467.
Siddi Māsaud, 463.
Siddi Raihan, 414.
Siddoji Ghorepara, 243.
Sikandar Adil Shah, 436.
Simhāchalam, 141, 143, 146, 147.
Simhādri, 138.
Simhādri-Poṭṭunūra, 147.
Simhaḷa Dēvi, 44.
Sindabur, 21, 22.
Sinduvaḷḷi, 211, *passim*.
Sipāh-i-Sālār, 166.
Śīra, 217, 230, 241, *passim*.
Śiva, 45.
Śivaganga, 285.
Śivaganga (Ramnad), 353.
Śivāji, 234, 235, *passim*.
Śivanāth Singh, 517.
Śivappa Nāyaka, 232.
Śivanasamudram, 126, 131, 133, 135, 142, 143.
Siyad Sultan, 532.
Soares, 158.
Sōmandahaḷḷi, 192.
Somerset, Protector, 147.
Sōmēśvara, 251.
Son (River), 537.
Śoṇasila (Soṇāchāla, Tiruvaṇṇāmalai), 95, 118.
Soumeilpūr, 544.
South India and Her Muhammadan Invaders, 34.
South Indian Insscriptions, 31, 53.
Spain, 315.
Śrīmushṇa, 235, 240, *passim*.
Śrīranga, 201–3, *passim*.
Śrīrangam, 10, 62, 64, 95, 285, *passim*.
Śrīranganāyakī, 218.
Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇa (Śrīrangapaṭam), 70, 91, 202, 204, 206, *passim*.
Śrīranga Rāyal, 206, *passim*.
Śrīśaila (Śrī Śailam), 95, 143, 148 *passim*.

Śrī Vīra Vijaya Virūpākshapura, 15.
Sthāpanachārya, 30.
Stirling, 41.
Subba Rao, N. Mr., 421.
Śūḷagere, 424.
Sultan Muhammad, 7, 8, 9.
Sultānpūr, 177, 183.
Sumatra, 12.
Sundara Pāṇḍya, 6.
Sundara Pāṇḍya I, *Jaṭāvarman*, 18.
Sungut Rāy, 165.
Swamikaṇṇu Pillai, Mr., 29, 184, 514.
Suragiri, 314.
Śūraikkuḍi, 29.
Surat, 435.
Sūryaprakāśa Rao, 428.
Syed, 8.
Syed Marcar, 156.

T

Taḍiparati, 95.
Tāḍpatri, 36, 94.
Talakāḍ, 215, *passim*.
Tālikōta, 2, 173, 182, 183, *passim*.
Tama Rao, 75, 85.
Tammē Gauḍa, 418.
Tanasery, 570.
Tāṇḍavarāya Piḷḷai, 353, 354.
Tangēḍa, 144.
Tanjore, 202–4, 206, *passim*.
Tanmarāya, 75.
Tapa Tapa, 399.
Tarikh-i-Firoz Shahi, 32.
Tauḷavas, 69.
Tāvaragere (Tāvarakere) 177, 183.
Tavernier, 490.
Taylor, Rev. William, 337.
Tegnapatnam, 309.
Tej Singh, 352, 513, *passim*.
Telangi, 57.
Telingana, 25, 42, 46, 47, 55, 56, 57, 58, 65, 66, 71 80, 136, 138, 140, 144, 145, 147.
Tennanāyakar, 347.
Terukaṇāmbi, 96.
Tētārao, 94.
Tēvāram, 19.
Thēraṇi Singh, 513.
Tikri, 408.
Timapanāyque, 159.
Timarasa, 85, 86.
Timma, 53, 54, 65, 70, 76, 98.
Timmouji, 178.
Timmaṇa, 43, 46, 54.
Timma Naika, 217
Timmappa Daṇṇāyaka, 169.
Timmappa Gauḍa, 235, 236.
Timmappa Nāyaka, 227, 348, 561.
Timmarāja (Timrāj) 53, 82, 83, 84, 86.
Timmarāja Woḍēyar, 210, *passim*
Timmarasa, (Tymarasa), 87, 94.
Tinḍivanam, 518.
Tiriśirapuram, 356.
Tiruchengoḍe, 439.
Tiruchirāpaḷḷi-Uśāvaḍi, 19.
Tiruchirāpaḷḷi Uḍaiyān, 19.
Tirukaḷākkuḍi, 27.
Tirukaṇāmbi, 216, 231, 236, *passim*.
Tirukkaḍaiyūr, 151.
Tirukkalaiyattānkuḍi, 425.
Tirukkoilūr, 65, 72, 73, 518.

Tirumala, 118, 200, 257, 260, *passim*.
Tirumala Aiyangar, Minister, 205, *passim*.
Tirumalādēvi, 139, 145, 160, 170.
Tirumalaimāvali-Vāṇādirāyar, 347.
Tirumalairāya (Tirumalarāya), 69, 204, *passim*.
Tirumala-Kantarāya, 143.
Tirumalāmbā, 256.
Tirumala Nāyaka, 266, *passim*.
Tirumala-Rāghavarāya, 143.
Tirumala-Rāhuttarāya, 143.
Tirumalarāya, 169, 170.
Tirumalayaṇṇa-daḷapa, 53, 54.
Tirumeyyam Taluk, 7.
Tirumōhūr, 342.
Tirupati (Tirumale, Tirumalai), 63, 139, 142, 148, 155, 167, *passim*.
Tirumukkuḍlu Narasīpura, 215, *passim*.
Tiruppattūr, 28, 29, 30, 516.
Tirupputkuḷi, 30.
Tiruvaḍamarudūr, 63, 426.
Tiruvaiyār, 517.
Tiruvallam, 252.
Tiruvāmāttūr, 518.
Tiruvaṇṇāmalai, 10, 15, 18, 19, 63, 65, 95, 118, 144, 148, 284, *passim*.
Tiruvēngaḍa Piḷḷai, 531.
Tōḍar Mall, 513.
Tōhūr, 298, 323.
Tonḍi, 538.
Toongabadra (River), 82, 83, 185, *passim*.
Toppūr, 264, 323.
Travancore, 197.
Tribhuvanam, 356.
Trichinopoly, 17, 19, 88, 204, *passim*.
Triplicane, 565.
Tripura (Trichinopoly), 235.
Trivāḍi, 295.
Tughlaks, 2.
Tukaji, 517.
Tukka, 138, 170.
Tuḷu, 27.
Tuḷuvas, 89, 96.
Tuḷu Rājya, 72, 96.
Tuḷuva Narasa, 79.
Tuḷuva (Tuḷuvēndra), 60, 70, 75.
Tumbichchi Nāyakkar, 348.
Tumkūr, 73, 235, 252, 268, *passim*.
Tupākki Krishnappa, 395.
Turki, 57.
Turson Bahadur, 166.
Turukkāḷpaṭṇam, 200.
Turushkas, 69
Turuvēkere, 229.

U

Udaipur, 466.
Uḍayadēvar, 353.
Uḍayārpāḷayam, 413.
Uddanḍakhan, 144.
Udyādri (Udayagiri), 70, 79, 96–7, 123–4, 127, 136–9, 142–3, 146–8, 156, *passim*.
Ugra, 338.
Ujjain, 118.
Ulāpati-Khan, 338.
Ummattūr, 96, 125–8, 130, 131, 134, 135, 170, *passim*.
Umras, 399.
Uṇṇamulai Paṭṭaṇam, 15.
Uppiliyappankōvil, 296.

Uraiyūr, 94.
Uttarakōśamangai, 149.

V

Vaigai, 282.
Vaishṇavas, 68.
Vallam, 260, 441.
Vaḻudāvūr, 518.
Vānaravīramadura, 351.
Varada, 348.
Varāhapurāṇam, 70, 71.
Varthema, 96.
Vēḍōji, 232.
Veḷḷaiyan-Śērvaikkāran, 351.
Veḷḷikurichchi, 354.
Vellore (Vēlūr), 132, 134, 199, *passim*.
Velover, 311.
Velugōṭi, 377.
Venkōji, 442.
Venkaṭa, 201, 203, *passim*.
Venkaṭa I, 320.
Venkaṭa II, 204.
Venkaṭādri, 118.
Venkaṭagiri, 322.
Venkaṭa Nāyak, 418.
Venkaṭapati, 245, 259, *passim*.
Venkaṭapatirāya, 206, 320, *passim*.
Venkaṭaperumāl Nāyakkar, 351.
Venkaṭarāyar, 358.
Venkaṭēśa Makhi, 288.
Venkaṭēśvara Mudaliyar, 357.
Venkat Rao, 527.
Venṟū, Maṇgoṇḍa Śambuvarāyan, 31.
Vēṇugopāla Chetty, V., 170.
Verasheroone, 549.
Verona, 568.
Verupacarao, 50.
Vēṭṭaivanam, 518.
Vidarbha, 537.
Vidyānagara, 16, 93.
Vidyāraṇya, 2, 3.
Vijayakumāramuttutirumalai Nāyakkar, 351, 354.
Vijayanagar (Vijayanagara) 1, 2, 3, 13, 15, 16, 25, 27, 28, 33, 35, 38, 39, 40, 41, *passim*.
Vijayarāghava, 297.
Vijayarāghava Nāyaka, 269.
Vijayarangachokkanātha Nāyakkar, 351.
Vijaya Rangamuttuchokkanātha Nāyakaraiyan, 350.
Vikramāditya, 118.
Vikramarāya, 222, 223, *passim*.
Vindhyas, 147, 537.
Vinukoṇḍa, 127, 137, 144.
Vīrabhadra, 127, 135, 137, 141, 144.
Vīrabhadra Durga, 412.
Vīrabhadra Nāyaka, 228, 418.
Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III, 5, 10, 14–20, 23–5, 29, 30, 196, *passim*.
Vīrabhadrasēna, 144.
Vīra Bukka Rāyalu, 26.
Vīra Narasimha, 74, 76, 90–2, 94–8, 118, 119, 120–2, 130, *passim*.
Vīra Narasinga Rāya, 92, 93, 204.
Vīra Pāṇḍya, 6, 28, 29.
Vīrappoḍeya, 160.
Vīra Rāmanātha, 18, 70.
Vīrēśalingam Pantulu, Rao Bahadur, 71, 146.
Viriḍo, 163.
Virinchipuram, 252.

Virūpāksha (Virūpaca), 35-7, 44, 45, 47-9, 53-5, 66, 72-4, 198, *passim*.
Virūpāksha II, 49, 52.
Virūpāksha Baḷḷāḷa, 20.
Virūpākshapaṭṭaṇa, 15, 16.
Viśaiyālaya Dēvar, 29.
Vishṇu, 63.
Visha Lakshaṇa Pandit, 236, 240, *passim*.
Vishṇuvardhana Biṭṭi Dēva Rāya, 69.
Viśvanātha, 285.
Vizagapatam, 143, 147.
Vriddhāchalam, 285.
Vṛinchipuram, 132.
Vṛishapaṭṭana, 418.

W.

Wairagarh, 56.
Waligandapuram, 404.
Wandiwash, 378.
Warangal, 2, 3, 7, 15, 25, 46, 81, 495.
Watt, Sir G., 537.
Wazīrābād, 57.
Wemmer, 311.
West Coast, 25, 26, 72, 197, *passim*.
Western Ghats, 64, 65.
Wheeler, Talboys, 564.
Wilks, Colonel, 205, *passim*.
Wilson, 420.
Woḍeyars, 205, *passim*.

Y

Yāchama Nāyaka 203, 292, *passim*.
Yādava, 4, 60, 61, 209, *passim*.
Yadu Rāya, 208, *passim*.
Yagñanārayaṇa Dīkshita, 287.
Yatirāja (Itirāja), 327, *passim*.
Yavanapati, 39.
Yavanas, 70, 71.
Ydallcao, 156, 157, 161.
Yeḷandūr, 216, 236, 240, *passim*.
Yeḷandūrumangala, 221.
Yimmaḍi-Bhairarasa-Oḍeya, 96.
Yoosoof Adil Khan, 83, 84.
Yusuf Adil Shah, 82, 83, 153.
Yusuf Khan, 342, 357.

Z

Zahur bin Zahuri, 404.
Zamorin, 128, 129.
Zemelluco, 157, 163.
Zulfikar Khan, 505.

PART II

A

Āay, 634, 662, 676, 690, 865.
Āay Eyinan, 659, 874.
Abhaya, 713.
Abhayagirivihāra, 714.
Abul Fazal, 837.
Adam's Peak, 706.
Ādi, 863.
Ādi Mandi, 658.
Āditya Karikāla, 623.
Adiyamān, 626, 633, 660, 662, 676, 865.
Adiyamān Anji, 620, 662.
Adiyamān Neḍumān Anji, 597, 599.
Aḍiyārkkunallār, 643.
Agenor, 668.
Ahanānūṟu, 586, 591, 597, 622, 651, 655, 658, 764, 766-8, 771, 863.
Aham, 651, 654, 658-60, 720.
Ahapporuḷ, 655.
Aḥdai, 720.
Ahirbudhnya Samhita, 815.
Ainguṟunūṟu, 601, 656, 771, 863, 865.
Aioi, 688.
Airāvata, 583, 584, 686.
Aiyūr Muḍavanār, 720.
Ajātaśatru, 697.
Ajitakēśakambaḷin, 785.
Ājīvaka, 788, 789.
Ājīvaka Kāśu, 789.
Akaḷanka, 776.
Akshapāda, 782.
Alasanda, 710.
Āḷavandār, 741-3.
Alexander, 668, 669.
Alexandria, 711.
Aḻimukham, 674.
Āḻvār Tirunagari, 730, 731.
Amarāvati, 580, 632.
Amudan, 742.
Ānaimalai, 648.
Āṇḍāḷ, 738.
Āniyūr, 825.
Anni, 659.
Anni Gñimili, 720.
Antigonus, 669.
Anula, 713.
Anurādhāpura, 695.
Appar, 663, 794, 802.
Araṭṭamukkidāsan, 734, 742.
Aṟayam, 602, 620, 662, 676, 862.
Aṟavaṇa Aḍigaḷ, 776-82, 798-9.
Ārgali, 675.
Arikēsarin Māravarmam, 770.
Ariśil Kiḻār, 600, 658.
Arjuna, 585, 592.
Ārpākkam, 703.
Arsakes Mithridates I, 670.
Arumbā Kiḻān, 849.
Aśela, 708.
Arthaśāstra, 820-2.
Ashṭabhujakaram, 746, 752-4, 759.
Asoka, 665, 666, 669, 670, 673, 697, 698, 701, 707, 718, 719, 723.
Aśōkārāma, 710.

Aśvagōsha, 784.
Aśvattāman, 625.
Aṭṭakathā, 694, 695, 701, 712.
Āṭṭaṇatti, 658.
Aṭṭapuyakaram, 754, 755.
Augustus, 688, 689.
Avanti(s), 682, 797.
Avantisundarīkathāsāra, 775.
Avvaiyār, 597, 598, 603, 618, 620, 621, 660, 612, 863.

B

Babruvāhana, 592.
Bādāmi, 634, 747, 749, 846.
Bahiya, 712.
Bakarai, 688.
Baktria, 670.
Bālakumāra, 616, 630.
Baḷija, 801.
Baṇajigas, 801.
Baṇavāsi, 775.
Baniya, 801.
Besnagar, 807.
Bhagavān, 863.
Bhagavatpāda, 831, 833.
Bhairava, 630.
Bharata, 578.
Bhāratavenbā, 589, 763-5, 769, 771.
Bhārata War, 578.
Bhāravi, 775.
Bhāskara, 831, 837, 838.
Bhāskararāya Makhin, 838.
Bhaṭṭakumāriḷa, 786, 787, 832, 833.
Bhaṭṭavṛtti, 823-5, 829, 834.
Bhavadāsa, 787, 788, 831, 832, 835, 838.
Bhaviṣyōttarapurāṇa, 582.
Bhūtacatukkam, 706.
Bhūta Pāṇḍyan, 621.
Bhūtattār, 737.
Bindusāra, 666, 670, 697, 701.
Bimbisāra, 697.
Bōdhāyana, 783, 786-8, 831, 832, 838.
Bōdhāyanavṛtti, 836.
Bōdhimaṇḍa, 710.
Brahmāda Araiyan, 850.
Bṛhad Bāṇa, 792.
Bṛhaspati, 782.
Bṛihat Kathā, 691.
Buddhagōṣa, 695.
Buddha Mitra, 764, 765.
Buddankōṭṭam, 741.
Byzantines, 689.

C

Cakrarāyar, 842, 843.
Caitra, 581.
Caracalla, 689, 691.
Caucasus, 670.
Centum, 742.
Cēramān Perumāḷ, 867.
Cēramān Śelvakkaḍungōvāḷiyādan, 863.
Cēra Māntharam Śēral Iṛumporai, 602.
Chāḷukyas, 692, 741, 747, 757, 795, 798, 856.
Champāpati, 797.
Chāṇakya, 697.
Chaṇḍamukhaśiva, 713.
Chāndōgya Upanishad, 806.
Chandragupta, 665, 666, 669, 670, 697, 701, 721.
Chēramān Māvaṇkō, 597.

Chintādēvi, 707.
Chintāmaṇi, 636, 643.
Chitaldroog, 673.
Chitra, 630.
Chitramuyari, 578, 581.
Chōḻa Parāntaka I, 593.
Cōḻa Kiḷḷi, 597.
Coranāga, 713.
Cornelius Nepos, 673.
Cūḷavaṁśa, 703, 704.

D

Dakkiṇagiri, 710.
Dakshiṇāpatha, 673.
Damiḷādēvi, 713.
Daṇḍin, 775, 776.
Danti Durga, 751, 754, 756-8, 762.
Danti Varma, 757.
Dāṭhika, 712.
Dēva, 781.
Dēvānāmpiyatissa, 698-700, 707.
Dēvaśvāmin, 786-8, 831-2, 835, 837-8.
Dharmadatta, 831.
Dharmakīrti, 798.
Dharmapāla, 776.
Dhunuttara, 630.
Diadochi, 669.
Digambara Darśana, 654.
Diṅnāga, 776, 779-80, 798, 799.
Dīpavamśa, 694, 695, 697, 698.
Divyāvadāna, 788.
Duṭṭagāmaṇi, 700.
Dvārāpati, 862.

E

Ēkāyana, 806, 807.
Eḷāra, 708, 709.
Ēḻil-kuṉṟam, 726.
Ēḻil Malai, 873.
Elimalā, 726, 727.
Eḻini, 586.
Ellora, 747, 844.
Ēḻumalai, 723.
Erumaiyūr, 586.
Ērumānāṭṭu Nalliyakkon, 598, 625, 864.
Eudamos, 669.
Eukratides, 670.
Eumenes, 669.
Evvi, 634, 662, 676.

F

Fa Hien, 632, 652.

G

Gajabāhu, 609, 610, 623, 625-30, 642, 643, 645, 666, 667, 678, 690, 717, 771, 866, 867.
Ganga Rāja, 598, 626.
Gangaikoṇḍa Chōḻa, 743.
Gangaikoṇḍa Chōḻapuram, 743.
Gauls, 670.
Ghōṣitārāma, 710.
Giri, 712
Gōkarṇam, 723.
Gōvinda, 833.
Gōtamīputra Śatakarṇi, 631.
Goṭhakābhaya, 713, 714.
Guṇāḍya, 691.
Guptas, 670, 692.
Gūrjjaras, 682, 796, 797.
Guttika, 696.

H

Hālāsya, 597.
Harpalos, 674.

Harsha, 673.
Hastivarman, 653.
Hieun Tsang, 624, 632, 652, 776, 779.
Himalayas, 579, 580, 586, 592, 616.
Hiung-nu, 670, 671.
Hoyśālas, 602, 635, 798.

I

Īḷam, 681.
Iḷaṁ Cheḻiyan, 616, 618, 619, 625.
Iḷaṁ Kiḷḷi, 615, 790, 792.
Iḷam Peruvaḻudi, 808.
Iḷanāga, 713, 720.
Iḷandirayan, 625, 775, 790.
Iḷangō, 600, 615.
Iḷangōvaḍigaḷ, 620, 780.
Iḷanjētchenni, 609, 623, 873.
Indradhvaja, 581.
Innā, 601, 863.
Iṟaiyanār Ahapporuḷ, 591, 766-8, 770.
Iṟungō, 676.
Iṟungōvēḷ, 620, 633, 662.
Iṟungōveṇmān, 586.
Īśipatṇa, 710.
Iyūr Mūlangiḻār, 597.

J

Jaimini, 782, 785, 787, 788, 815, 831, 837.
Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya, I, 579.
Jaṭila, 648.
Jaṭilavarman, 647.
Jayaṁ Koṇḍān, 623.
Jeevakachintāmaṇi, 643, 644.
Jētavana, 710.
Jeṭṭatissa, 714, 715.
Jina, 782.

K

Kadaba, 747.
Kaḍambin-peruvāyil, 873.
Kaḍambu, 616.
Kaḍuvan Iḷa-Eyinan, 808, 812.
Kākanda, 795.
Kākandi, 794.
Kakuda Kātyāyana, 785.
Kāḷahasti, 793, 794.
Kāḻaham, 681.
Kaḷaṁ Kāy Kaṇṇi Nārmuḍi Cēral, 874.
Kaḻar Kiḷḷi, 615.
Kaḻāttalaiyār, 602, 657.
Kaḷattūr, 825.
Kaḷavaḻi, 609.
Kaḷvar Komān Pulli, 651.
Kālēṟu, 793.
Kāḷidurga, 745.
Kalinga, 747.
Kāḷingi, 793, 795.
Kalingattupparaṇi, 609, 623, 629, 866.
Kallāḍan, 587, 874.
Kallāḍanār, 658, 720.
Kalpaka, 584, 686.
Kalpavṛkṣa, 583, 584.
Kalyāṇi, 706.
Kamban, 731-3.
Kambanāḍan, 730.
Kambanāṭṭāḻvār, 729.
Kampavarman, 801, 802.
Kāṇāda, 782.
Kanaka, 616, 630.

Kānappērēyil, 597, 617.
Kanishka, 672.
Kaṇṇaki, 600, 603, 618, 640-2, 645, 777.
Kapālichcharam, 803.
Kapilar, 600-2, 616, 618, 620, 629, 651, 658, 711, 782, 861, 862, 865-7.
Kāravēla, 671.
Kāri, 615, 620, 633, 659, 660, 662, 790-3, 865.
Karigāl, 609.
Karikāla, 608-12, 614, 617, 619, 623-6, 631, 642, 645, 651, 657, 660, 677, 678, 710, 713, 773, 774, 790, 866.
Kāri-kaṇṇan, 721.
Kārikkarai, 794.
Kārikkarai Uḍaiya Nāyanār, 793.
Kārimāran, 761.
Kāriyāṟu, 790-3, 795.
Karūr, 619, 632, 633, 654, 674, 683, 745.
Kāśika, 838.
Kāsmīra, 710.
Kaśyapa, 722, 723.
Kātyāyana, 773.
Kauṇālaka, 653.
Kaurāḷaka, 653.
Kaurāḷaka Manṭarāja, 653.
Kauṭilya, 820, 821.
Kāvēri, 626, 627, 632, 674, 675, 677, 678, 681, 706, 789, 795, 872.
Kāvērippaṭṭiṇam, 582, 721, 777, 778, 789, 790, 794, 796, 797.
Kāverippūmpaṭṭinam, 609, 611.
Kāvyadarśa, 776.
Kāvya Mūshakavaṁśa, 725, 726.
Kelāsavihāra, 710.
Kēraḷa, 665.
Kēraḷōlpatti, 723.
Kēraḷaputra, 718.
Khanḍadēva, 837, 838.
Khaśas, 721.
Kiḷḷi, 608, 612, 614, 615, 625, 626, 775.
Kīrandaiyār, 808, 811.
Kōchchengaṇ, 608, 609, 623, 733, 744.
Koḍaivāśal, 722.
Koḍumbai, 683.
Kōiloḻuku, 741.
Koinos, 668.
Kōkkiḷḷi, 619, 623.
Kollēr Lake, 653.
Kolli Hill, 620.
Kolli Malai, 618, 634, 659, 662, 676, 791, 865.
Kollippāvai, 658.
Kōḷur, 648.
Kongu, 633, 659, 662, 676, 719, 720, 722, 724, 725, 734.
Konkaṇ, 672, 724, 725, 868, 869, 871, 872, 874.
Koṇkāṇi, 724.
Koṇ-Peruṁ-Kānam, 724.
Koppam, 741, 743.
Korkai, 616, 618, 634, 675, 676, 683.
Kośakāras, 721.
Kosala, 747.
Kośar, 659, 661, 662, 718-23.
Kōvalan, 603, 617, 626.
Kōvil-kiḻār, 616.
Kranganūr, 626.
Krishṇa, 579, 675, 676, 747.
Kṛtakōṭi, 782, 785-7, 831, 838.
Kṣatriya Vrātyas, 721.
Kuchchara-Kuḍikai, 796, 797.
Kuḍakkō Neḍuṁśēralādan, 657.

Kūḍalūr Kiḻār, 766, 863, 865, 866.
Kuḍapulaviyanār, 587.
Kulachirai, 770.
Kuḷamuṟṟam, 616.
Kulaśēkharāḻvār, 734, 738, 866.
Kulōttunga, 623, 626, 710, 734.
Kumaṇa, 714.
Kumari, 675.
Kumāriḷa, 839.
Kuṇavāyil, 600.
Kuṇḍalakēśi, 622.
Kūn Pāṇḍyan, 663, 732, 733.
Kuṟaḷ of Tiruvaḷḷuvar, 596, 617, 622, 636, 767, 768, 820, 821, 863.
Kurāḷa, 665.
Kurinji, 601.
Kurinjippāṭṭu, 601, 711, 863.
Kūrat Āḻvār, 742.
Kurugūr, 738.
Kuṟumbiyan, 720.
Kuṟundokai, 656, 659, 863.
Kurungoḻiyūr Kiḻār, 586.
Kushāṇa(s), 671, 672, 691.
Kūṭṭuvan, 600.

L

Laksaṇa Grantha, 590.
Lambhakaṇṇas, 713.
Laṭa, 747.
Limurike, 680.

M

Machetas, 668.
Madhavāchārya, 784.
Mādhavi, 777.
Madhurakavi, 729, 730, 738, 761.
Madhusūdhana Sarasvati, 837.
Madurai-kāñji, 586, 619.
Madurai Kūlavāṇigan Śāttan, 600.
Madurai Marudan Iḷanāgan, 591.
Madura Sthalapurāṇa, 597.
Maeris, 668.
Magadha, 669, 673, 682, 797.
Mahābalipuram, 733, 801, 847.
Mahābhārata, 584, 585, 588, 589, 591, 592.
Mahābhārata War, 577, 578.
Mahābhāshya, 773.
Mahānāman, 695, 867.
Mahānirvāṇa Tantram, 822.
Maharathas, 578.
Mahrattas, 797.
Mahāsēna, 695, 705, 714, 715.
Mahātiṭṭa, 706.
Mahāvaṁśa, 610, 629, 667, 673, 675, 678, 692, 693-8, 711, 715, 716.
Mahāvaṁśa Ṭīka, 695.
Mahāvihāra, 667, 694, 714, 715, 717.
Mahiḷārōpya, 800, 804.
Mahiṇda, 695, 697, 698, 700, 705, 707.
Maisolos, 675.
Maiyilārpu, 800, 801.
Malai-kaḷam, 578.
Malaināḍu, 617, 620, 865.
Malayamān, 676, 684, 791-3.
Malaiyamān Tirumuḍikkāri, 602.
Māḷavikāgnimitra, 820.
Malik Kafur, 635.
Mallai, 801.
Malloi, 668.
Mallinātha, 582.
Mālva (Māḷava, Mālwā) 673, 747, 861.
Māmanḍūr, 734.

Māmūlanār, 651-3, 661, 665, 666, 720.
Māmūlar, 654, 723.
Mānābharaṇa, 626.
Mandara Gaurava, 592.
Māndaraṁ Śēral, 652, 653, 665.
Māngudi Marudan, 586, 619, 620, 685.
Maṇihīravihāra, 715.
Māṇikkavāśagar, 638, 730, 733.
Maṇimangalam, 703.
Maṇimēkhalai, 582-4, 600, 627, 640, 643-7, 656, 663, 667, 691, 706-8, 767, 774, 776, 777, 780-5, 787-90, 798.
Maṇipallava, 707, 777, 782.
Maṇisōmārāma, 712.
Maṇiyakkika, 706.
Maṇṇai, 745.
Maṇṇaikkuḍi, 745.
Manṭarāja, 652, 665.
Mānthāram Śēralirumporai, 618.
Manu, 708, 721.
Marāḍam, 682.
Mārankāri, 648.
Markali, 788.
Markali Gośāla, 785.
Marudan, 720.
Marudan Iḷanāgan, 767.
Maski, 665.
Matsyapurāṇa, 630.
Mauryas, 651, 652, 654, 665, 666, 669-71, 720, 721.
Mayilai, 800, 801, 803.
Mayilāppil, 802.
Mayilārpu, 802-4.
Mayūraśarman, 775.
Mārōkkattu Nappaśalaiyār, 602.
Māvilangai, 625.
Metellus Celer, 673.
Menander, 671.
Mēghavaṇṇābhaya, 715.
Migāili, 658, 659, 874.
Mogūr, 712.
Mohūr, 651, 654, 665, 720.
Mousikanos, 668.
Muḍathāma Kaṇṇiyār, 609, 611, 620.
Muḍattirumāran, 596, 767.
Mudrārākshasa, 721.
Muḷḷūr, 602, 659, 862.
Muḷḷūr Hill, 620.
Mūrtināyanār, 649.
Muśiri, 658.
Muṭaśiva, 700.
Muttra, 671.
Muziris, 674, 680, 681, 688, 690.
Mylapore, 800-4.

N

Nachchinārkkiniyar, 599, 766.
Nādhamuni, 730-4, 742-4, 748.
Nāgacatukkam, 706.
Nāgadīpa, 705.
Nāganika, 807, 816.
Nāgārjuna, 672, 781.
Nagas, 706.
Nakkīrar, 586, 591, 619, 620, 651, 720, 766-8, 771, 821.
Nakshatra Viśākha, 796.
Nalaṁkiḷḷi, 615.
Nal Eḻini, 808.
Nallā Piḷḷai, 588, 658, 720.
Naḷḷi, 659, 865.
Nallūr, 620, 733, 721, 722.
Nallūr Nattattanār, 598, 600, 620, 864.

Nālukaviperumāḷ, 749.
Nālūr, 721.
Nambi Āṇḍār Nambi, 866.
Nammāḻvār, 729–35, 738, 739, 748, 761.
Nānāghat, 807.
Nandas, 652, 665, 669, 697.
Nandi, 756, 757.
Nandippōttaraiyar, 769.
Nandipōttarāja, 745.
Nandivarman, 745–8, 756, 758–60, 764, 765.
Nandivarman of Pallava-Malla, 588.
Nandivarman of Teḷḷāṟu, 588.
Nannan, 616, 658–61, 719, 720, 725, 871, 873, 874.
Nārada, 806.
Narasimha, 626, 650.
Narasimhavarman, 634, 663.
Naṟṟiṇai, 656, 658, 659, 764, 863.
Navakadir, 788.
Nāyars, 718.
Nilakēśittiraṭṭu, 622.
Nīlakhanṭan, 821.
Nīliya, 713.
Niṅṟasīr Neḍumāran, 663.
Nirgrantha, 784, 788.
Nirgrantha Jñātīputra, 785.
Neḍumāran, 732.
Neḍuṁ Cheḻiyan, 616, 618, 619, 631, 642, 645, 649, 658, 663, 666, 768.
Neḍuṁśēralādhan, 617.
Neḍumuḍikkiḷḷi, 615, 623, 774, 790, 792.
Neḍunalvāḍai, 619.
Neḍunguḷam, 683.
Nelvēli, 746.
Nenmeli, 745, 746.
Nērivāyil, 612, 615–7, 619, 792.
Nero, 689.
Nūṟṟangaṇṇan, 642, 645, 646.
Nūṟṟuvar Kaṇṇar, 646.
Nyeacinda, 675.

O

Ōri, 659, 662, 676, 865.
Oṭṭakkūttan, 710.
Oxus, 670.
Oxyartes, 668.
Oxydrachoi, 668.
Oxykanos, 668.

P

Padigam, 599.
Padiṟṟuppattu, 599, 640, 656, 660, 664, 863.
Pālai-pāḍiya-Peruṁ-Kaḍuṁko, 874.
Paḻaiyan Māran, 651, 652, 665, 712.
Pālaka, 653.
Pāḷayagars, 676, 871.
Pāḻi, 658, 659, 693, 695, 721, 873.
Pallavabhogga, 710.
Pallava Simhavarman, 580.
Palyāgaśālai Mudukuḍumi Peruvaḻudi, 649.
Pāncarātra, 805, 806, 820.
Pāncarātra-Samhitas, 818.
Panchatantra, 800, 804.
Pānḍukābhaya, 700.
Pānḍyan Neḍuṁśeḻiyan, 580.
Paṇayamāra, 712.
Parākramabāhu, 626, 702–4.
Parākrama Pānḍu, 703, 704.
Pāram, 873.
Paramāra Rājputs, 861.

Paramasaṁhita, 844.
Paṟambunāḍu, 601, 620, 633, 662, 676, 861, 864.
Paramēśvaravarman, 745, 746.
Paramēśvara Varman Pallava, 733.
Paramēśvara Viṇṇagar, 745, 746, 759, 761.
Paraṇar, 598, 600, 603, 618, 620, 651, 657–8, 660–4, 723, 865–6, 874.
Parānkuśa, 577.
Parāntaka I, 624, 649, 851, 866.
Parāntaka Śaḍaiyan, 592.
Paraśurāma, 722, 723.
Parimēlazhahar, 756.
Paripāḍal, 808, 817, 878.
Pāṇini, 773, 807, 826, 827.
Pārāsaryamata, 838.
Pāri, 620, 629, 633, 662, 676, 861–2, 864–6.
Paropanisadae, 668.
Pārthia, 672.
Parthians, 670.
Paṭalene, 668.
Pāṭali, 654.
Pāṭalīpura, 652, 653, 721.
Paṭṭinappālai, 609–11.
Patanjali, 773, 774, 783, 807.
Pattuppāṭṭu, 586, 640, 644, 655, 863.
Pavattiri, 774, 792, 794.
Pāḻi-Nāḍu, 871.
Pērāśiriyar, 822.
Pēhan, 600, 620, 633, 658, 660, 662, 676, 865–6.
Pērār, 626, 668, 669.
Philip, 668, 669.
Perdiccas, 669.
Periplus, 680.
Periyāḻvār, 738.
Periyapurāṇam, 650, 708, 791, 794.
Periyār, 616, 683, 866.
Periyatirumoḻi, 741.
Periyatiruvandādi, 731.
Perumbāṇappāḍi, 790, 792.
Perumbāṇāṟṟuppaḍai, 613, 740, 774, 790.
Perumdēvanār, 588–9, 591, 644, 657, 763–5, 769, 771, 816.
Perundurai, 659.
Perumkunṟūr Kiḻār, 600, 658.
Perum-Śellūr, 723.
Perum Śēral, 620.
Perumśēralādhan, 612.
Peruvīraṟkkiḷḷi, 602.
Petronius, 679.
Pēy Āḻvār, 737.
Pinbaḷagiya Jīyar, 742.
Pinḍan, 659.
Pirahattan, 711.
Pirambu, 873.
Piṭakas, 712.
Piḷayamāra, 712.
Podiyil, 676, 720, 865.
Podiyil Hill, 634, 662, 721.
Pohuṭṭeḷini, 597.
Ponni, 872.
Ponpaṟṟi, 765.
Poonamallee, 580.
Porunan, 586.
Porunarāṟṟuppaḍai, 609, 611.
Porundil Iḷangīranār, 602, 618.
Porus, 668.
Poygai Āḻvār, 737.
Prabhākara, 786–7, 832–3.
Prabhandam, 738, 740, 802.
Prahasta, 863.

Pramāṇa Samuchchaya, 798.
Prapañchahṛdaya, 787, 828, 830, 832, 833.
Ptolemy, 688, 690.
Ptolemy Philadelphus, 669.
Puhār, 584, 603, 607, 612-6, 619, 625, 626, 633, 675, 677, 678, 681-3, 686, 691, 706, 789, 790.
Pulahatta, 711.
Pulikaḍimāl Iṛuṅgōvēl, 601, 602, 862.
Pulli, 658,
Puṛanāṉūṛu, 586, 587, 597-601, 615, 616, 618, 619, 621, 623, 625, 640, 644, 655, 657, 660, 714, 724, 766, 767, 863.
Purāṇa Kaśyapa, 785.
Puṛapporuḷ, 655.
Puruhūtadhvaja, 582.
Pushyamitra Sunga, 671.

R

Raghu, 582.
Raghuvaṁśa, 582.
Rāhuḷabhadra, 672.
Rājabāhu, 627.
Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkshita, 838.
Rājādhirāja, 703, 743.
Rajagāha, 710.
Rājakēsarivarman, 825.
Rājamahēndra, 741, 744.
Rājarāja, 734, 742, 802, 825, 828, 866.
Rājaratnākari, 627.
Rājasimha, 592, 649, 776.
Rājasūya, 597.
Rājavaḷi, 627, 628.
Rājēndra, 623, 734, 741, 743.
Rājēndra Chōḷadēva, 704.
Rāmagiri, 793, 794.
Rāmantaḷi, 723.
Rāmānuja, 733, 741-3, 806, 827, 834, 836-9.
Rāmānujanūṛrandādi, 742.
Rāmāyaṇa, 721, 731-3.
Rāshṭrakūṭa, 741, 752, 756-8, 795.
Rāshṭrakūṭa Dantidurga, 747.
Rāshṭrakūta Gōvinda III, 580.
Ratnadvīpa, 782.
Rāyakōṭṭa, 624.
Rēva, 757.
Rohāṇa, 711.
Romans, 670, 689.
Rome, 688.
Roxana, 668.
Rudirangaṇṇanār, 611, 612, 620.
Rudra, 630.
Rudraśarman, 591, 766-8.

S

Śabara, 832, 833, 835-9.
Sābara Bhāṣya, 832.
Śabarasvāmi, 787, 788.
Śabdakalpadruma, 839.
Śaḍagōparandādi, 732, 733.
Śaḍayappah, 732.
Śakas, 670-2.
Śakradhvaja, 582.
Samantakūta, 706, 782.
Samantapāsādhika, 695.
Sambandar, 650, 663, 749, 750.
Sambus, 668.
Samudragupta, 624, 634, 652, 653, 665.
Samyamīnāmamāla, 786.
Sandhubhūpa, 747.

Sangamitta, 697, 714, 715.
Sanghabhodhi, 713.
Sanghatissa, 713.
Sanjaya Belaṭṭi-Putta, 785.
Śankara Bhāṣya, 833.
Śankarāchārya, 783, 784, 805, 833.
Śankaraṣaṇa, 816.
Sapta Śaila, 726.
Sārvabhauma, 585.
Sarva-siddhānta-Samgraha, 783-4.
Sātakarṇin, 630, 631, 642, 645, 646.
Śaṭakōpa, 761.
Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, 806.
Sātavāhana, 691.
Satiyaputra, 673, 718, 719, 723.
Śāttanār, 651, 781.
Seleucidae, 670.
Seleucus Nikator, 669.
Śeḻiyan Śēndan, 649, 663.
Śellūr, 720-3.
Śēlpākkam, 804.
Śelvakkaḍungō, 864.
Śēna, 696.
Śenguṭṭuvan Śēra, 595-6, 599, 603, 609, 612, 615-6, 618-9, 621, 623, 625, 628, 630-2, 634, 638-9, 651-2, 657-8, 660, 664, 667, 678, 791-2, 795, 866.
Śēralādan, 651.
Śēramān Neḍum Śēralādan, 660.
Seshas, 747.
Shah Jahan, 838.
Skanda, 588.
Skandaśishya, 624.
Ślōkavārttika, 838.
Śibi, 709.
Śilappadhikāram, 580, 581, 583, 600, 609, 640, 642-6, 656, 659, 663, 666, 667, 708, 710, 716, 720, 767, 780, 808, 866.
Simhavaktra, 776, 780.
Simha Vishṇu, 746, 776.
Śinga, 630.
Śinnamanūr, 592, 640, 647-9, 763, 768, 769, 771, 816.
Śiṟupāṇ, 599.
Śiṟupāṇāṟṟuppaḍai, 598, 600, 616, 620, 625, 658, 789, 864.
Śīttalaichchāttanār, 600, 620, 780.
Śiva, 588.
Śivajñāna Siddhi, 789.
Śivamāra, 624.
Śīyadōni, 853.
Soḻi, 627.
Soḻi Raṭṭa, 627.
Śōḻiyavēnādi Tirukkaṇṇan, 602.
Somā, 711, 712.
Somalā, 711.
Somārāma, 712.
Śoṇa, 715.
Sophytes, 668.
Sri Parambi, 624.
Śrīśaila, 747.
Subrahmaṇya, 588.
Sucaritamiśra, 838.
Suevi, 674.
Sumana, 707
Sundaramūrti Nāyanār, 629, 750, 770, 866, 867.
Sundara Pāṇḍyan, 663, 732.
Suratissa, 707.
Sūtras, 590, 591.
Suvarṇapiṇḍa Tissa, 708.

Svarṇamukhi, 792, 793.
Śvēta, 680.

T

Tagaḍūr, 597, 620, 633, 660, 662, 676, 865.
Talaiyālangānam, 578, 581, 584, 586–7, 592–3, 618, 649, 658, 663, 679, 766–71, 816.
Talakāḍu, 598, 626.
Tambapanni, 675, 698.
Tāmraparṇi, 675.
Taṇka, 747.
Tantra, 820, 822.
Tantrakāra, 820.
Tantrākhyāyika, 820.
Taprabane, 675.
Taxila, 668.
Telingana, 631.
Teḷḷāṟu, 764, 765, 769.
Tenkaṇa, 724.
Tēvāram, 663, 802, 803.
Tiruviḷayāḍal Purāṇam, 597, 617, 862.
Tiberius, 688.
Tidiyan, 720.
Tigaḻoḷināyiṟṟēḻparineḍumtēr Chōḻan, 657.
Tīka, 696.
Tiṟaiyan, 759, 775, 792, 794.
Tiruchchandaviruttam, 814.
Tirugñānasambanda(r), 624, 732, 748.
Tirukkāraikkarai, 794.
Tirukkōṭṭiyūr Nambi, 743.
Tirukkōvilūr, 598, 620, 633, 660, 662, 676, 683, 684, 792, 865.
Tirumāliruñjōlai, 617, 814.
Tirumaḻisai Āḻvār, 737, 814.
Tirumangai Āḻvār, 734, 736, 738, 741–4, 748–51, 761–2, 770, 802.
Tirumangaimannan, 731, 740.
Tirunāraiyūr, 739, 744, 746.
Tirunāvukkaraśu, 794.
Tiruneḍundāṇḍakam, 742.
Tirupati, 793.
Tiruppāṇ Āḻvār, 738.
Tiruppārkaḍal, 849.
Tiruttonḍattogai, 770, 866.
Tiruvālangāḍu, 794.
Tiruvālīśvara, 703.
Tiruvḷḷuva Mālai, 766.
Tiruvaḷḷuvar, 601, 617, 620, 862, 863.
Tiruvārūr, 708.
Tiruvāśiriyam, 731.
Tiruvāymoḻi, 730, 731, 734, 739, 748.
Tiruvottiyūr, 801.
Tiruviruttam, 731.
Tissa, 711, 715.
Titiyan, 586.
Tolkāppiyam, 589, 821, 822.
Tonḍaimanḍalam, 753, 759, 790, 792.
Tonḍaiyar, 753, 774, 792, 793.
Tondaiyarkōn, 753.
Tonḍamān, 612, 613, 758, 790, 794.
Tonḍamān Iḷandirayan, 612, 662, 774.
Tonḍaraḍippoḍi Āḻvār, 738.
Tonḍi, 618, 620, 633, 674–6, 678, 683.
Triplicane, 802.
Trippāśūr, 794.
Tungabhadra, 632.
Tuvarai, 601, 620.

U

Udaya III, 702–4.
Udaya Chandra, 745, 746, 760.
Udayēndram, 760.
Ugra-Pāṇḍiyan, 596–7, 617, 619, 622, 709, 766–8.
Ugrapperuvaḻudi, 591, 596.
Ugrasēna, 653.
Ukkal, 734.
Upavarsha, 786–8, 832, 838.
Uppūrikkuḍi Kiḻān, 591, 766.
Uṟaiyūr, 605, 612, 615, 617, 623, 625, 633, 661, 683, 789, 792, 865–6.
Uruvappaḥarēr-Iḷanjētchenni, 611, 657.
Uśanas, 721.
Uttara, 630.
Uttaramērūr, 851.

V

Vaḍukar, 666.
Vāhaippaṟandalai, 874.
Vaigai, 683, 817.
Vaikkarai, 675.
Vairamēghan, 746–7, 753–6, 758–9.
Vaiyāvikkōn Perumbēhan, 600.
Vajranāḍu, 631.
Vajranandi, 654.
Vajrāyuda, 583, 584, 686.
Vaḷanjiyar, 801.
Vālīśvaram, 793, 794.
Vambamōriyar, 665.
Vaṁsaṭṭappakāśinī, 694.
Vanavāsa, 710.
Vanji, 607–8, 616, 626, 654, 661, 674, 678, 683, 778, 789, 865–6.
Varaguṇa Pāṇḍyan, 624, 635.
Varāhamihira, 691, 772.
Vārttikas, 773.
Vasu, 578, 579.
Vāsudēva, 816.
Vaṭṭagāmaṇi, 711, 712.
Vātāpi, 650.
Vaṭuka, 713.
Vēdanārāyaṇapperumāḷ, 825.
Vēdānta Dēśika, 806, 835, 839.
Vēdāntapradīpa, 836.
Vēdavyāsa, 782, 785, 787, 788.
Veḷiyan Tittan, 659.
Veḷḷiyan Kallu, 674.
Vēḷ Pāri, 601.
Vēlūrpāḷayam, 757, 758.
Vēḷvikkuḍi, 640, 647–9, 816.
Vēngaḍam, 775, 792.
Vēngai-mārban, 597, 617.
Vengi, 653.
Veṇṇainallūr, 732.
Veṇṇil, 609, 612, 677.
Vērpaharaḍakkai Peruvīraṟkkiḷḷi, 657, 660.
Veṟṟivēr Cheḻiyan, 618.
Vessagiri, 711.
Vētulya, 713, 714.
Vichchikkōn, 601, 616, 662, 862.
Vichitra, 630.
Viddamayya, 858.
Vidharba, 671.
Vidiśa, 666.
Vijaya, 578, 616, 630–1, 699, 700, 706.
Vijñānamātra Śāstra, 784, 785.
Vikrama, 626.
Vikramabāhu, 623.

Vikramāditya, 671.
Vikrama Pāṇḍyan, 626.
Vikkirama Śōḻan Ulā, 608, 609.
Villava, 745, 746.
Villiputtūrar, 588.
Vīra Kēraḷa Varman, 626.
Vīra-Nārāyaṇa, 624.
Vīra Pāṇḍyan, 623, 626.
Vīrarājēndra, 765.
Vīra Ravi Varman, 626.
Vīra Śōḻiyam, 764.
Vishṇu, 588.
Vishṇugōpa, 624, 625, 634, 653.
Vishṇuvardhana, 626.
Vishṇuvardhana Hoyśala, 598.
Viyalūr, 616, 618, 873.
Vohārikatissa, 713.
Vṛittikāra, 787, 788.
Vyāsa, 783, 831.

W

Wijesimha, 703, 705.
Wikramasinghe, 704.
Wu-sung, 670.

Y

Yagña Śrī, 631.
Yāmunāchārya, 806.
Yānaikkaṭchēy, 863.
Yavanas, 681, 682, 711, 797.
Yegñasēna Sātakarṇi, 671.
Yudhiṣṭhira, 583.
Yuet(h)-chi, 670, 671.

Z

Zungaria, 670.

PRINTED AT
ANANDA PRESS, MADRAS.

Works of

Dewan Bahadur Dr. S. Krishnasvami Aiyangar.

S. No.	Name of the publication.	Cost. Rs.	A.	P.
1.	**Social Legislation under Hindu Governments.** (Pamphlet. Mythic Society's reprint) ...	0	4	0
2.	**Early History of Vaishnavism in South India.** (Oxford University Press) ...	1	2	0
3.	**Hindu States in Southern India, A.D. 1000-1565.** (Chapter XVIII, The Cambridge History of India, Vol. III) ...			
4.	**G. Jouveau Dubreuil's Dravidian Architecture.** (English Translation) ...	1	8	0
5.	**The Beginnings of South Indian History.** (The Modern Printing Works, Madras)...	3	12	0
6.	**Some Contributions of South India to Indian Culture.** (Readership Lectures to the Calcutta University; being reprinted) ...	6	0	0
7.	**South India and her Muhammadan Invaders.** (Oxford University Press) ...	8	0	0
8.	**Hindu India from Original Sources, Parts 1 and 2.** (K. & J. Couper, Bombay). each ...	1	4	0
9.	**A Short History of Hindu India.** (Companion to the above. K. & J. Couper, Bombay) ...	1	8	0

S. No.	Name of the publication	Cost Rs.	A.	P.
10.	**Manimekhalai in its Historical Setting.** (Luzac & Co., London) ...	5	0	0
11.	**The Evolution of Hindu Administrative Institutions in South India.** (Sir William Meyer Lectures, published by the Madras University) ...	4	0	0
12.	**Sewell's Historical Inscriptions of South India.** (Published by the Madras University) ...	12	0	0
13.	**A Class-book of Indian History.** (Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co.,) ...	2	0	0
14.	**A Visit to the Sevan Pagodas.** (Re-printed from the Indian Antiquary) ...	4	0	0
15.	**The Paramasamhita of the Pancharatra.** (Gækwad's Oriental Series) ...	8	0	0
16.	**Sri Venkatachala Itihasamala.** (With an English Introduction, published by the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Committee) ...	1	0	0
17.	**A History of Tirupati in two volumes.** (Published by the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Committee). each	3	0	0
18.	**Seran Vanji.** (Published by the Cochin Government)	1	12	0
	Ancient India and South Indian History & Culture. (Two Volumes.) each	10	0	0

—

SOME NOTEWORTHY BOOKS OF

THE POONA ORIENTAL SERIES

		Rs. As.
1.	भगवद्गीता शाङ्करभाष्योपेता ed. D. V. गोखले. 2nd ed. ...	7- 8
2.	Constructive Survey of Upaniṣadic Philosophy by Prof. R. D. Ranade ...	11- 4
3.	Manual of Pali by Prof. C. V. Joshi	3-12
4.	Rāṣtrakutas & Their Times by Dr. A. S. Altekar ...	8- 8
5.	Dr. Ganganath Jha Commemoration Volume ...	17- 8
6.	अमरकोश क्षीरस्वामीटीकायुत with marginal English meanings, Appendices by डॉ. शर्मा & सरदेसाई ...	7- 8
7.	Ancient Karnatak by Dr. B. A. Saletore	11- 4
8.	Picturesque Orientalia by Dr. R. N. Sardesai. Being an Album of 103 Photos of Western Indologists ...	11- 4
9.	न्यायसूत्र (गौतम) वात्स्यायनभाष्य, खद्योतटीका ed. Dr. Jha ...	6- 4
10.	,, Complete English Trans. by Dr. Jha ...	10- 0
11.	Prof. P. V. Kane Commemoration Vol. (Festschrift).	17- 8
12.	छांदोग्योपनिषद् Eng. Trans. of Text & शांकरभाष्य by डॉ. झा.	7- 8
13.	गांधी गीता by S. N. ताडपत्रीकर. Being the elucidation of Gandhian Philosophy in Sanskrit Verse ...	3-12
14.	Ancient India & South Indian History & Culture by Dr. S. K. Aiyangar. 2 Vols.	22- 8
15.	Catalogue of Indological Books during 1930–46 ...	2- 0
	Supplementary to Catalogue No. 2 of 1930 priced at	3- 0

ORIENTAL BOOK AGENCY

15, SHUKRAWAR, POONA 2